

CIVIL LIBERTIES
HEALTH
HOUSING
PROFITS AND DIVIDENDS
POLITICAL AFFAIRS
LABOR LAWS
STRIKES AND BOYCOTTS



New World Paperbacks
NW-51 \$1.65

LABOR FACT BOOK

by LABOR RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

A PEOPLE'S ALMANAC

ON A WIDE RANGE
OF CURRENT TOPICS

17

UNEMPLOYMENT
COLD WAR BUDGETS
ECONOMIC TRENDS
DISCRIMINATION
ANTI-SEGREGATION SIT-INS
PEACE ISSUES AND GROUPS
NUCLEAR TESTS
YOUTH MOVEMENTS
EDUCATION
CIVIL RIGHTS
CIVIL LIBERTIES
HEALTH
HOUSING
PROFITS AND DIVIDENDS
POLITICAL AFFAIRS
LABOR LAWS
STRIKES AND BOYCOTTS
MIGRANT FARM WORKERS
HUAC
McCARRAN AND TAFT-HARTLEY
LABOR & PEACE CANDIDATES
LOYALTY OATHS
NEGRO VOTING
WAGES & HOURS
WOMEN'S RIGHTS
OLD-AGE BENEFITS
DISARMAMENT
TRADE UNIONS
TAXES
BALANCE OF PAYMENTS
FAMILY INCOME
POVERTY

NEGRO CONDITIONS
DRUG CONTROL
MENTAL HEALTH
SOCIAL SECURITY
AUTOMATION
SCHOOL INTEGRATION
ACADEMIC FREEDOM
YOUTH PROGRAMS
LABOR CONVENTIONS
FARM EARNINGS
PRICES AND PARITY
ELECTIONS
FREEDOM RIDERS
UNEMPLOYMENT
COLD WAR BUDGETS
ECONOMIC TRENDS
DISCRIMINATION
ANTI-SEGREGATION SIT-INS
PEACE ISSUES AND GROUPS
NUCLEAR TESTS
YOUTH MOVEMENTS
EDUCATION
CIVIL RIGHTS
CIVIL LIBERTIES
HEALTH
HOUSING
PROFITS AND DIVIDENDS
POLITICAL AFFAIRS
LABOR LAWS
STRIKES AND BOYCOTTS
MIGRANT FARM WORKERS
HUAC
McCARRAN AND TAFT-HARTLEY

LABOR & PEACE CANDIDATES
LOYALTY OATHS
NEGRO VOTING
WAGES & HOURS
WOMEN'S RIGHTS
OLD-AGE BENEFITS
DISARMAMENT
TRADE UNIONS
TAXES
BALANCE OF PAYMENTS
FAMILY INCOME
POVERTY
NEGRO CONDITIONS
DRUG CONTROL
MENTAL HEALTH
SOCIAL SECURITY
AUTOMATION
SCHOOL INTEGRATION
ACADEMIC FREEDOM
YOUTH PROGRAMS
LABOR CONVENTIONS
FARM EARNINGS
PRICES AND PARITY
ELECTIONS
FREEDOM RIDERS
UNEMPLOYMENT
COLD WAR BUDGETS
ECONOMIC TRENDS
DISCRIMINATION
ANTI-SEGREGATION SIT-INS
PEACE ISSUES AND GROUPS
NUCLEAR TESTS

10-
+ 8666

LABOR FACT BOOK 17

**PREPARED BY
LABOR RESEARCH ASSOCIATION**



**INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS
NEW YORK**

© 1965, by International Publishers Co., Inc.
Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 31-20156
Manufactured in the United States of America



FOREWORD

The present volume in the *Labor Fact Book* series that started in 1931, deals mainly with the period between early 1963 and the first months of 1965. In view of the later publication date in 1965 many recent items, for example, the latest Social Security changes, have been covered. In some cases data from earlier years have been included to provide background or show trends over a longer period.

We have again devoted a whole chapter to peace issues in view of the international balance of terror and the admitted dangers in the Vietnam war. These facts should be of particular value to those active in widening people's movements to prevent a world nuclear catastrophe. We have not repeated the basic descriptions of various peace organizations included in earlier volumes.

In the expanded chapter on civil rights and Negro conditions we have tried to cover all recent major movements and events preceding the passage of the Voting Rights Act in August 1965.

The extensive section dealing with poverty reflects the increased attention this subject has been receiving from economic, labor and political leaders, especially those concerned with the "war on poverty" measures of the Johnson Administration.

As in our monthly *Economic Notes*, all facts and figures are mainly from standard government, business, labor and general publications. Although sources are given for exact quotations, sources for any statement are always available for those doing further research on a given subject. As usual the number of cross references has been limited because of the full index.

For space-saving purposes we have often abbreviated the names of unions. For example, the United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (AFL-CIO), is contracted to Auto Workers, and similar abbreviations are used for other organizations.

We are indebted to many persons who have cooperated in the preparation of the material. For example, we appreciate the advice of Holland Roberts on subjects relating to education and peace, of Rose Coe on farm topics, and of Louise Pettibone Smith on the treatment of the foreign born. The leaders of several civil liberties, peace, labor and political organizations have been generous in preparing data on their recent activities.

We hope this book will serve as a useful tool in the continuing struggle for civil rights, real democracy, social progress, general disarmament and enduring peace in the world.

Labor Research Association
80 East Eleventh Street
New York City, N.Y. 10003

August, 1965

CONTENTS

Foreword	3
I. ECONOMIC TRENDS	9
Business Expansion, 9	
The Unemployment Problem, 11	
Profits in Prosperity, 13	
"Limited Wars" Budgets and Taxes, 15	
Monopoly and Concentration, 18	
Farmers Decline, Crops Increase, 20	
II. LABOR AND SOCIAL CONDITIONS	24
Income Distribution, 24	
Poverty in the United States, 25	
Low Incomes in South, 30	
City Worker's Family Needs, 31	
Real Earnings of Factory Workers, 32	
Women Workers, 32	
Jobless Young Workers, 33	
Unemployment Insurance, 34	
Minimum Wage Legislation, 35	
Work Injuries and Deaths, 37	
Workmen's Compensation Inadequate, 38	
Social Security Developments, 39	
Inadequacies of Public Assistance, 40	
"General Assistance," 42	
New York Relief Situation, 43	
Conditions of the Elderly, 43	
Medicare and Health Insurance, 45	
Life Expectancy and Infant Mortality, 47	
Hours of Work, 48	
Farm Workers, 50	

Puerto Ricans in U.S., 52
 American Indians, 54

III. PEACE ISSUES AND ACTIVITIES

56

Atomic Arms Race, 56
 Concentration of Military Contracts, 57
 Test Ban Treaty, 58
 Peace Convocation, 59
 Women's Int'l League for Peace and Freedom, 60
 Women Strike for Peace, 61
 Quaker Position, 63
 Conscience on Vietnam, 64
 Congressional Conscience on Vietnam, 65
 Chemical Warfare Condemned, 66
 Washington March Against War, 67
 Student-Faculty Action for Peace, 68
 Other Forces for Peace, 69

IV. NEGROES AND CIVIL RIGHTS

71

Negro Incomes, 71
 Negro Women Workers, 72
 Unemployment and Job Discrimination, 73
 Washington March, 75
 Civil Rights Act of 1964, 76
 Desegregation in Southern Schools, 77
 School Segregation in the North, 79
 Mississippi Summer Project, 81
 Triple Lynching of Rights Workers, 83
 Nightmare in Mississippi, 84
 Other Killings of Negroes, 85
 Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, 86
 Southern Voting Registration Struggles, 88
 Segregation in Housing, 92
 Police Terror in the North, 94
 Monroe Frame-up Reversed, 95

V. CIVIL LIBERTIES

97

Un-American Activities Committee, 98
 Denver Smith Act Case, 101
 McCarran Act Repression, 101
 Right to Travel, 103

Archie Brown Test, 104	
Morton Sobell, 105	
Protecting the Foreign Born, 105	
Mail Curb Lifted, 107	
Free Speech on Campus, 108	
State "Subversive" Act Upset, 109	

VI. U.S. TRADE UNIONS

110

AFL-CIO Convention, 110	
Industrial Union Department Convention, 114	
Women in U.S. Unions, 115	
Factory Worker Agreements, 117	
1963 Union Contract Provisions, 117	
Major Contract Gains—1964, 118	
Deferred Increases Due in 1965, 119	
Teachers Bargain Collectively, 120	
Federal Government Employees, 121	
U.S. Strikes of 1963-1964, 122	
Union Pension Plans, 126	
"Right-to-Work" Repealer, 128	
Cold War Line, 129	

VII. POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS

131

Record of 88th Congress, 131	
Elections of 1964, 134	
Negroes and Women in Congress, 135	
Negroes in the Election, 136	
Newspaper Election Line-up, 138	
State Legislatures and Governors, 138	
Labor's Political Participation, 139	
Minority Voters, 140	
Right Wing Post-Election Position, 141	
Communist Party of the USA, 142	
Socialist Party, 144	
Americans for Democratic Action, 145	
One Man, One Vote, 146	
General Voting Restrictions, 148	
A \$200 Million Campaign, 149	
Millions Spent by Right Wing Groups, 151	

I. ECONOMIC TRENDS

BUSINESS EXPANSION

The U.S. economy continued to expand in both 1963 and 1964 and was continuing strong in the first part of 1965. The figure for total gross national product rose about \$27.7 billion in 1963 to \$583.9 billion and by \$38.7 billion in 1964 to a total of \$622.3 billion. The President's Council of Economic Advisers was forecasting a total of \$660 billion for 1965, although some private economists made lower estimates as the economic expansion entered its fifth year.

After adjustment for price changes, the overall rise in real gross national product was about 3.8% in 1963 and about 4.7% in 1964. A somewhat lower rate of growth was expected in 1965.

Commenting on the growth of the economy in recent years the Joint Economic Committee of Congress in its 1965 annual report noted that "new records in our economic statistics are not enough. The economy's performance must be measured against its potentials—that is, against what it is capable of doing now, not what it did sometime in the past. We are compelled to note again that by this standard there is still much to be accomplished. Since 1957, there has been a wide gap between this country's total demand and its potential output of useful goods and services. This chronic slack has tended to hold down consumption, investment, savings, employment and output. Doubtless it has also contributed to our balance-of-payment difficulties."

Industrial Production: The index of industrial output of the Federal Reserve Board (covering manufacturing, mining and utilities) rose from an average of 118 in 1962 to 124 in 1963 and to 132 in 1964. (Average for 1957-59 = 100.) By April 1965 it had risen to 141 but was not expected to go much higher in the course of the year.

The advance in 1964 in both the gross national product and the industrial production index was the result in part of the temporary stimulating effects of the federal income tax cut in that year. Activity was increased also in the later months of 1964 because of the catching up in automobile output after the strike as well as the inventory stockup of steel in anticipation of a strike in that industry in 1965.

Capital Outlays: Expenditures for new plant and equipment totaled about \$39 billion in 1963 advancing to nearly \$45 billion in 1964. For 1965 the surveys of business plans indicated a somewhat smaller rise—of nearly 12%—was expected for a total of over \$50 billion. Mechanization and modernization in the form of new equipment continued to account for the major part of new capital outlays in these years.

Construction and Housing: Expenditures for new construction of all kinds rose from \$62.5 billion in 1963 to \$66 billion in 1964 and was expected to go a little higher in 1965 especially as there was no sign of slowdown in industrial and commercial building.

Housing, however, was admitted to be one of the weak spots. The *Monthly Review* of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco (March 1965) noted that although residential construction spending rose 3% (to \$26 million) in 1964 as a whole, "this sector experienced a persistent decline from the beginning to the end of the year. The weakness was due to market factors and not to lack of financing," as it had been in other business cycles.

Summarizing the housing situation in its April 24, 1965, issue, *Business Week* noted that "housing is in the doldrums. After hitting an all-time high late in 1963, housing starts trended downward most of last year, rebounding only in the last quarter. Then, instead of continuing on their new direction, they dipped again in the first quarter" of 1965. They were not expected to equal the total of 1964 when the number of private nonfarm housing starts was 1,525,200, down from 1,581,700 in 1963.

Consumer Spending and Debts: Consumer expenditures continued to rise in this period, the total for all goods and services, as estimated by the Commerce Department, was nearly \$400 billion in 1964, an increase of over \$24 billion above the previous year. Referring to the "dependable consumer," the Report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers notes that "consumers, in the aggregate, purchase roughly two-thirds of our total output."

The expansion in consumer expenditures has been facilitated by a continued expansion in consumer debt and especially in instalment debt. Total consumer credit outstanding had risen to \$76 billion by the end of the first quarter of 1965, up about \$7 billion over a year before; and instalment debt alone had risen to \$60 billion compared with under \$54 billion a year before.

The relationship of total outstanding consumer instalment debt to income rose from a little over 10% in 1955 to 13.4% in 1964.

It is pointed out repeatedly that "this powerful growth of outstanding instalment debt represents a claim on future income and thus remains a source of potential difficulty in the event of an adverse change in the economic environment." (Mellon Nat'l. Bank & Trust Co., *Monetary Indicators*, March 19, 1965.)

Price Trends: Consumer prices inched upward in 1964 at about the

same rate as in the two previous years. Services, medical care, transportation were the major components in the rise. Commodities other than food were little changed from the previous year.

The consumer price index (1957-59 = 100) rose from an average of 105.4 in 1962 to 106.7 in 1963 and to 108.1 in 1964. It continued rising moderately in the first half of 1965.

Wholesale prices have been generally stable not only in the last two years but in previous years back to 1958. The all-commodity index of the Department of Labor has ranged between 100 and 101 in this period (1957-59 = 100).

The Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City in its *Monthly Review* (Nov.-Dec., 1964) noted: "Price developments throughout the current expansion have been remarkably restrained." The bank attributes this stability to the rising productivity of labor resulting from installation of new equipment. It mentions also "moderation in wage demands" that "has characterized much of the expansion." This, combined with the higher productivity, has "resulted in an actual decline in unit labor costs in manufacturing."

The bank organ notes also the influence of unemployment in holding down prices. As it puts it, "competitive pressures occasioned by substantial unemployed labor resources, as well as considerable unutilized plant capacity, have exerted a salutary effect on maintaining stable prices over much of the expansionary period." And it looks forward to a continuation of this trend due to the persistence of a "sizable pool of both unemployed human and capital resources."

Cost of Recessions: In its discussion of "Growth Prospects for the Longer Run" in its Economic Report to the President in 1965, the Council of Economic Advisers has a paragraph on cost of recessions:

"Even minor recessions have huge costs. In the postwar period, the United States has successfully avoided a recurrence of the seriously depressed conditions of the 1930's, but it has experienced 4 recessions which caused personal hardships for millions of Americans. During the course of these recessions, on average, real GNP fell by more than 3%; the unemployment rate rose by 2 percentage points. . . . In the years most heavily scarred by recession, the number of people unemployed long enough to exhaust their unemployment compensation benefits rose by 840,000; the number of families with incomes below the \$3,000 poverty line rose by 400,000; and the number of families receiving general assistance payments rose by 70,000."

THE UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM

"The number one problem is still unemployment," said President Johnson in his Manpower Report of the President in 1965, repeating what the late President Kennedy had said two years earlier in a similar

report. Johnson added: "Despite recent improvements unemployment and underemployment are intolerably high."

The Manpower Report of 1965 prepared by the U.S. Department of Labor noted that, although there had been a rise in employment of about 1.5 million during the year, "the reduction in unemployment rates . . . while significant, was not as impressive. For the year as a whole, total unemployment averaged 3.9 million, or 5.2% of the civilian labor force." This was a drop of only one-half a percentage point below the rate of 1963.

Making further comparisons with earlier years, the report declared that "the level of unemployment remains unsatisfactory—1964 was the 7th successive year in which the unemployment rate averaged over 5%." The rate was lower than that "registered in the preceding expansion, but was still substantially above the levels of close to 4% achieved during the prosperous years 1955–57, and even further removed from the 3% rate achieved during the Korean conflict, 1951–53."

Inadequate Growth: The report also emphasized the fact that even though there was economic recovery from 1961 on, the "entire 3.5% increase in output between 1962 and 1963 was absorbed merely in keeping pace with the job replacement required by productivity increases or in creating jobs for the 1 million new entrants into the labor force. The growth was inadequate to reduce unemployment." In fact, "unemployment actually rose by 150,000 between 1962 and 1963."

With full-time unemployment, as measured by the government, at close to 5% of the civilian labor force at the end of 1964, the report considered it "our most serious economic problem" not only because the rate itself is high, "but even more significantly because of what the overall rate represents in the burden of unemployment carried by certain groups—particularly the young, nonwhites, and the uneducated and unskilled."

It notes also that, "Chronic unemployment continues to be concentrated very largely among those same disadvantaged groups. On the average, there were nearly a million people who had been looking for work 15 weeks or longer in 1964, including nearly half a million who had been out of work 6 months or longer; close to 200,000 of them had been unemployed a year or more."

At the end of 1964 full-time unemployment, even as measured conservatively by the government, "still remained," said the report, "a percentage point higher than before the 1957–58 recession, and fully half this increase stemmed from the rise in long-term unemployment."

The manpower report estimated that the gross national product would have to grow at the rate of 4.75% a year if unemployment is to be brought down to the 3% level by 1970. Although GNP advanced at

about that rate in 1964 it has never done so for any sustained period. The report noted that "at no time in our recent history" has the U.S. been able to sustain a rate of increase in GNP of over 4% a year for more than a brief period. The average growth rate in the postwar years was only 3.5%.

The Department of Labor estimates that new entrants in the labor force will average about 1.5 million a year in the years between 1964 and 1970. At the same time over 2 million jobs a year are expected to be lost as a result of automation, displacement by machines and rising productivity.

Higher Real Total: The President in the manpower report referred not only to the 3.9 million average full-time unemployed in 1964 but said there was also "another 2.5 million who wanted full-time jobs but could only find part-time work." If the full-time equivalent of the involuntary part-time work is added to the full-time unemployed, as well as the concealed unemployment—the uncounted numbers who have withdrawn from the labor market because of discouragement or failure to find jobs—the real total unemployment rate would have come to possibly 9% of the civilian labor force in 1963–1964. (For further discussion of methods of measuring unemployment see *Labor Fact Book*, 15 and 16.)

Even if only the official rate for full-time jobless is taken for comparison, the U.S. in 1964 had a higher unemployment rate than any other major capitalist country. Its rate, as noted, was 5.2% compared with 4.7% in Canada; 2.9% in Italy; 2.5% in France and Great Britain; 1.6% in Sweden; 1.0% in Japan and 0.4% in West Germany.

PROFITS IN PROSPERITY

Total corporate profits before taxes have continued to increase during the last two years. The Commerce Department's estimate of profits both before and after taxes, of dividends and of undistributed profits are given in the table below, updating those in earlier numbers of *Labor Fact Book*. The estimates cover the prewar year 1939, the war year 1945, and the last 7 years through 1964.

Pretax profits in the last full year 1964 showed a gain of 12% over 1963, which in turn had been 6% over 1962. Profits after taxes showed even bigger rises—7% in 1963, and 19% in 1964, due partly to the cut in the corporate income tax rate in 1964.

Dividend payments to corporate stockholders also were rising in recent years. The estimated dividend total for 1963 was \$18 billion, a rise of 9% over the previous year; the total for 1964 was a record \$19.8 billion or 10% more than in 1963.

CORPORATE PROFITS AND DIVIDENDS

(billions of dollars)

Year	Corporate profit before taxes	Corporate profit after taxes	Dividend payments	Undistributed profit
1939	6.4	5.0	3.8	1.2
1945	19.0	8.3	4.7	3.6
1958	37.4	18.8	12.4	6.4
1959	47.7	24.5	13.7	10.8
1960	44.3	22.0	14.5	7.5
1961	44.2	21.9	15.2	6.7
1962	48.2	25.0	16.5	8.5
1963	51.3	26.7	18.0	8.7
1964	57.2	31.7	19.8	11.9

Even after payment of higher dividends, the undistributed profits total leaped ahead, especially in 1964 when it was up 37% to a high of \$11.9 billion.

Cash Flow Higher: "In terms of total cash flow," says *Business Week* (March 6, 1965), "there's been an even more dramatic improvement in business operating results. Partly because of liberalized depreciation in 1954 and 1962, and partly because of growth in capital investment, depreciation allowances have been rising faster than profits in the postwar years.

"The upshot is that today's operating results measured by total cash flow—after-tax profits plus depreciation allowances—look even better than the profit figures alone suggest. You have to go back to 1950, the pivotal year of the Korean War inflation, to find a figure that exceeds the 8.4¢ of cash flow posted on each dollar of sales in 1964."

The total cash flow has about doubled in the last decade, rising from \$32.7 billion in 1954 to an estimated \$65.3 billion in 1964.

An article in the *American Federationist* (Jan. 1965), "The Profits Glut of Big Business," comments on the rise in cash flow. It says that "finding a profitable outlet for the hoard of cash which has piled up in corporate treasuries has become a problem. Dividend payments have gone up, expenditures on plant and equipment have increased and still many corporations keep searching for other things to do with their money."

It notes also that dividends have doubled since 1953. The rise of 115% between 1953 and 1964 may be compared with the increases in wages and salaries of employees in that period of only 67%, and salaries include even the highest payments to corporation executives.

The tremendous increase in cash flow in recent years has also stimulated the merger movement, increasing the concentration of control in U.S. industry. (See below.)

A further rise in profits both before and after taxes was noted in 1965. Business economists were forecasting early in the year that profits, dividends and cash flow would continue upward. Before-tax profits were expected to rise to \$60 billion or higher, and after-tax profits to nearly \$35 billion.

"LIMITED WARS" BUDGETS AND TAXES

The cold war initiated by President Truman 20 years ago still continues, leading to armed conflicts—the Korean War and the undeclared escalating war in Vietnam—as well as military intervention, as against Cuba and then in the Dominican Republic under President Johnson. The cold war posture and military ventures are provided for in the number one item in the U.S. federal budget, euphemistically called “national defense.”

Priorities and Principles: In introducing the U.S. budget for fiscal 1966 in Jan. 1965, the President characterized it as a “budget of priorities” resting on “five basic principles”:

1. Fiscal policies “must promote national strength, economic progress, and individual opportunity.”
2. Our tax system “must continue to be made less burdensome, more equitable, and more conducive to continued economic expansion.”
3. The Great Society [which this budget “begins to grasp”] must be a *bold* society. . . .
4. The Great Society must be a *compassionate* society. . . .
5. The Great Society must be an *efficient* society.” (Italics in original.)

Of the 5 principles 3 are concerned with “grasping” the Great Society. It must not be supposed that the Great Society is a financial “priority” of significance within the budget. Nor (principle No. 2) has taxation become “less burdensome, more equitable.” The great discrimination against small incomes, especially implemented in the form of low personal exemptions of ever decreasing purchasing power, remains in the law. The indefensible favoritism of “Texas” billionaires continues in the form of percentage depletion allowances. In short, tax reform so loudly proclaimed as a feature of the Revenue Act of 1964 was dropped in favor of income tax reductions which did not remove the chief burdens from low-income taxpayers. But if over-kill capacity is “national strength,” then national strength is consistently promoted again (principle No. 1), even if “individual opportunity” has not reached millions of unemployed and World War II babies who annually reach working age—and draft age.

In summary, the following table shows receipts and expenditures for fiscal 1964 and estimates for fiscal 1965 and 1966, comprising both the administrative budget and the various trust funds:

FEDERAL BUDGET EXPENDITURES

(fiscal years ending June 30)

in billions

	1964 (actual)	1965 (estimate)	1966 (estimate)
<i>Administrative budget</i>			
National defense	\$ 54.2	\$ 52.2	\$ 51.6
Space research and technology	4.2	4.9	5.1
International affairs	3.7	4.0	4.0
Veterans benefits, services	5.5	5.4	4.6
Interest	10.8	11.3	11.6
Agriculture	5.6	4.5	3.9
Natural resources	2.5	2.7	2.7
Commerce and transport	3.0	3.4	2.8
Health, labor and welfare	5.5	6.2	8.3
Education	1.3	1.5	2.7
General government	2.3	2.4	2.5
Allowance for Appalachia	—	—	0.1
Other, net	(0.8)	(1.0)	(0.1)
	<u>\$ 97.7</u>	<u>\$ 97.5</u>	<u>\$ 99.7</u>
<i>Trust funds</i>			
National defense	\$ 0.5	\$ 0.8	\$ 1.0
Veterans benefits, services	0.7	0.6	0.5
Health, labor and welfare	22.7	23.4	26.5
Commerce and transport	3.5	3.9	3.7
Housing and development	1.9	0.2	0.8
Other, net	(0.4)	—	0.4
	<u>28.9</u>	<u>29.0</u>	<u>32.9</u>
Other adjustments	(6.2)	(5.1)	(5.2)
Total	<u>\$120.3</u>	<u>\$121.4</u>	<u>\$127.4</u>

Trust fund receipts and expenditures more or less offset each other. They are largely for social security.

It is the administrative budget total expenditure of \$99.7 billion (1966 estimate) which makes the headlines of the 100 billion dollar budget. Greater prominence is now given to the total budget, which includes social security receipts and payments.

To translate the 5 "basic principles" into action the President notes five features of the budget. Among them is support for "a massive defense establishment of steadily growing power, within reduced outlays." Note the reduction from actual 1964 to estimated 1965 and estimated 1966. This is wiped out in part by the \$700,000 "supplemental appropriation" funds voted by Congress in May 1965 on the President's request for escalated military operations in Vietnam.

Another feature noted includes "expanded programs and higher expenditures" to provide better education, to extend the war against poverty (item not identified), and to "help the Appalachian region lift

itself out of its present depressed condition" (all of \$100,000). This is the Great Society.

After the Revenue Act of 1964 and the fiscal 1966 budget, reductions in excise taxes are to be used to stimulate the economy. But these are largely sales taxes on luxuries.

However, sales taxes by states and cities will remain in force, or continue to grow. In the context of the U.S. budget of \$100 billion, mention must be made of state and local taxes, now approaching \$60 billion a year. While 33 states have income taxes, great reliance is placed on real estate taxes (locally and in some states) and on sales taxes. The latter are regressive and offset to a significant extent the limited progressivity of federal income tax. This aspect of taxation should be borne in mind in noting the sources of federal receipts, listed below:

FEDERAL BUDGET RECEIPTS

(fiscal years ending June 30)

in billions

	1964 (actual)	1965 (estimate)	1966 (estimate)
<i>Administrative budget</i>			
Individual income taxes	\$ 48.7	\$ 47.0	\$ 48.2
Corporation income taxes	23.5	25.6	27.6
Excise taxes	10.2	10.7	9.8
Other	7.1	7.9	8.8
Total administrative	\$ 89.5	\$ 91.2	\$ 94.4
<i>Trust funds</i>			
Employment taxes	\$ 16.8	\$ 16.7	\$ 18.7
Deposits by states, unemployment insurance	3.0	3.0	2.9
Excise taxes	3.5	3.6	4.0
Federal employee retirement	2.0	2.2	2.2
Interest in trust fund investments	1.6	1.7	1.9
Other	3.3	3.3	4.0
Total trust fund	30.3	30.5	33.6
<i>Adjustments</i>	(4.3)	(4.3)	(4.5)
Total	\$115.5	\$117.4	\$123.5

Wars Take 77%: Some facts remain more or less constant: Over 60% of the federal budget goes for "defense" and related items of space research and "international affairs." And if interest costs (mainly the result of borrowing for past wars and cold war) and veterans' benefits based on past wars, are added, we have about 77% of the federal budget going for wars of all kinds—past, present and future.

A gradually declining percentage of revenues is in the form of individual income taxes. State taxation increases more rapidly than the national budget. Hence less than one-third of the total of national, state

and local taxation is in the form of progressive individual income taxes, and even these taxes bear unduly heavily on low incomes. The principal need is to maintain and increase the progressivity of the federal individual income tax, to remove percentage depletion favoritism from the tax, to extend federal spending to cover social purposes not, or not well performed, by the states, and thus to reduce state taxation, so much of which is regressive.

MONOPOLY AND CONCENTRATION

The U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly in 1964 held hearings on the extent of economic concentration in the U.S. and found it had been increasing rapidly since the end of World War I.

Willard G. Mueller, head of the Bureau of Economics of the Federal Trade Commission, testified that in 1962 there were in the U.S. manufacturing industry about 180,000 corporations and 240,000 partnerships and proprietorships. These 420,000 business units had combined assets of about \$296 billion. The 20 largest of these manufacturing corporations had \$73.8 billion in assets, or an estimated 25% of the total. The 419,000 smallest companies accounted for only 25.2% of the total assets, or about the same amount as the largest 20.

When measured in terms of net profits or net capital assets the concentration is even greater. The 20 largest manufacturing corporations, with 25.4% of the total assets, accounted for 38% of the profits after taxes. Also the net profits of the 5 largest were nearly twice as large as those of the 178,000 smallest corporations combined.

Mueller reported also that in 1963, of the estimated 173,558 manufacturing corporations of the U.S. just over 1% had total assets of \$10 billion or more. Yet these few large corporations accounted for 82% of the assets of all manufacturing corporations. And the 1,080 firms with assets exceeding \$25 million controlled 76% of all manufacturing assets, while the 166 corporations with assets exceeding \$250 million accounted for 54% of the assets of all manufacturing companies.

The 100 Largest: Findings of the Federal Trade Commission, the Census Bureau and the economists of this Senate committee indicated that the 100 largest U.S. manufacturing corporations in 1962 controlled about 25% more of the nation's net capital manufacturing assets than they did 15 years before. This means that they now hold 57%, or just short of three-fifths of all property—land, buildings and equipment—used in U.S. manufacturing.

In testimony on July 1, 1964, leading economist Gardiner C. Means presented figures showing that the proportion of net capital assets controlled by the 100 largest manufacturing companies in 1929 was 44% but this had grown in 33 years to 58% in 1962.

The net capital assets included net land, buildings and equipment. These estimates, although less reliable for 1962 than for 1929, "suggest that there has been a very considerable increase in concentration in manufacturing as a whole in the last 33 years."

Dr. Means gives a list of the 100 largest manufacturing companies, in terms of total assets, the top 20 in order of size being Standard Oil (N.J.), General Motors, Ford Motor, U.S. Steel, Gulf Oil, Texaco, Socony Mobil Oil, Standard Oil (Calif.), Standard Oil (Ind.), E. I. DuPont, General Electric, Bethlehem Steel, International Business Machines, Shell Oil, Western Electric, Union Carbide, Phillips Petroleum, Getty Oil Companies, Westinghouse Electric, and International Harvester.

Increase in Concentration: Dr. John F. Blair, the committee's economist, in similar testimony on September 9, 1964, also showed that concentration in manufacturing as a whole increased in the 15-year period 1947-1962 by about 9 percentage points. "Specifically, in terms of total assets of all manufacturing companies the share held by the 100 largest increased from 39.3 to 48.1%, a rise of 8.8 percentage points, or 22%. In terms of net capital assets, the increase was from 45.8 to 56.8%, an advance of 11.1 percentage points, or 24%."

All these figures underestimate the extent of concentration, for they are based on the assumption that a company must own more than 50% of the stock of another in order to control it. Actually, control can be effected often with control of 25% or as little as 10% of the stock.

Other figures on the trend of overall concentration were given by Blair on July 2, 1964. He showed that the 200 largest manufacturing companies accounted for 30% of the "value added" by manufacture in 1947, rising to 40% by 1962. ("Value added" is the value of shipments minus, principally, the cost of materials.) For the 50 largest the increase in the same period was from 17% to 24%, that is 7 percentage points or 41%.

The Census Bureau compilation from which these figures are taken does not identify the companies that are among the 200 largest. Blair stated that "the listings in terms of total sales published by *Fortune* magazine should prove a reasonable approximation of the 200 largest in terms of value added." (These are annual listings by *Fortune*.)

Another indication of the greater concentration was cited by the Senate Committee on Small Business in its 14th annual report, July 1964. Concerning the decreasing number of concerns in the manufacturing field it noted that in the year 1962 alone some 4,000 plants disappeared from the economy "and were not replaced by new entries." Also, the years from 1957 to 1963 "witnessed a dwindling of the manufacturing sector. A high of 332,300 producing companies in 1957 shrank to but 313,000 plants in 1963." This shrinkage "provides positive

evidence that the country's producing sector is becoming more concentrated."

Mergers Increase: "It is fair to assume," Dr. Means told the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee July 1, 1964, "that the greatest increases in manufacturing concentration have come in the three periods of greatest mergering."

The latest report on significant mergers in the U.S. as recorded by the Federal Trade Commission shows that the number reached a post-war high of 1,797 in 1964, compared with 1,479 the previous year. The FTC also compared various 5-year periods showing a rise in mergers from 906 in 1940-44 to 3,365 in 1955-59 and to 4,366 in 1960-64.

The FTC notes that the figures "unquestionably not only confirm a definite and continued upward trend in the number of mergers but are proof that we are now in the midst of a significant merger movement."

In testimony before the Senate antitrust committee in July 1964, Prof. Corwin D. Edwards of the University of Oregon discussed the growing number of "conglomerate mergers," producing large companies that operate in many unrelated fields. He expressed concern that such businesses could exercise destructive power in separate markets, often subsidizing a losing division for a time from the profits of others and otherwise operating at a competitive advantage over companies specializing in a single product.

FARMERS DECLINE, CROPS INCREASE

Total net farm income in 1964 was estimated at about \$12.7 billion and income per farm at about \$3,659. There has been a substantial rise in the per farm income largely because of the greater concentration of agriculture in the hands of corporations and absentee owners. Although government payments rose by \$518 million between 1963 and 1964, farmers' total net income fell by \$311 million in the same period.

In his new study of *Agriculture and the Public Interest*, Leon H. Keyserling points out that "the tragic decline in total farm personal income, amounting to almost 11% from 1953 to 1964, occurred while nonfarm income rose 47.9% (in uniform 1963 dollars). Even on a per capita basis, in 1964, farm personal income from all sources was only \$1,494, contrasted with \$2,595 for nonfarm personal income." These figures would justify the conclusion of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress in its annual report, 1965: "The success of American agriculture has helped everyone but the farmer."

Fewer and Larger: The trend to fewer and larger farms continues. U.S. Department of Agriculture reports that the number of farms operated in the U.S. in 1964 decreased 3% from the previous year to a total of 3,479,000. The trend indicated that the number would

drop to 3,383,000 in 1965. In the seven years, 1959 to 1965, farm numbers decreased 18% while land in farms decreased 2%.

At the same time the average size of farm has continued to rise—from 288 acres in 1959 to 341 in 1965. This is the result of the “discontinuance of small farming enterprises and merging of larger units with existing farms.” (Crop Reporting Board, Jan. 13, 1965, release.)

The Administration as well as business economists call for the elimination of about 2.5 million additional farmers. In fact, the President's Budget Message, Jan. 28, 1965, admitted that “farming alone cannot be expected to provide a decent living in the future for more than about 1 million farm families, even with continued Government assistance. Many low-income farm families will have to find other ways of earning a living, or other sources of income to supplement their modest farm earnings.”

Mounting Debt: The vulnerability of farmers to cyclical pressure is shown in the figures of mounting farm debt. Farm real estate debt was estimated at \$18.7 billion on Jan. 1, 1965, up \$3.3 billion from Jan. 1, 1963. Non-real estate debt in the same period rose by \$3.1 billion to \$17.6 billion. On Jan. 1, 1947, when there were about 5.9 million farmers in the U.S., these two totals stood at \$4.9 billion and \$3.5 billion, respectively.

The number of farmers who have already left the land, as Keyserling points out, “has been appalling all things considered.” The total farm population declined from around 25.8 million in 1947 to an estimated 12.9 million in 1964. And in the same period the farm population declined from 17.9% to 6.7% of the total U.S. population, while farm employment went down from 10.4 million to about 6.1 million.

Despite the decline in farms and farm population the total farm output in 1964 was about 12% higher than in the 1957-59 period. And this added output came from about 295 million acres of crop land harvested compared with an average of 324 million acres in the base period.

Cost-Price Squeeze: The farmers' cost-price ratio, or the relation of prices received by and paid by farmers, continued its downward trend. It fell to 75% of the parity standard by the end of 1964 compared with 100 in 1952, 85 in 1958, and 78 in 1962. The “parity ratio” remained around the 75 level in the first half of 1965.

Another measure of the cost-price squeeze on farmers is the relation of total net income to cash receipts from farm marketings. In the post-World War II years total net fell from 52% of cash receipts in 1947 to 35% in 1964. The recent wholesale move of the major oil companies into the fertilizer industry further underlines the fact that smaller farmers buy in a sellers' market and sell in a buyers' market, in other words are subjected to monopoly control at both ends of their operation.

While the parity ratio has been falling and consumer food prices have

risen the farmer's share of the consumer food dollar has also been shrinking from a postwar peak of 54¢ in 1945 to 38¢ in 1961 and to 37¢ in 1964.

DEFENDING THE DOLLAR

One of the weaker sectors of the U.S. economic position in the last few years has been the continuing deficit in the U.S. balance of payments in relation to other countries.

Despite a favorable trade balance, with merchandise exports of \$25 billion in 1964 and an export surplus of around \$6.6 billion, other factors have contributed to the deficit, broadening the gap between funds leaving the U.S. and those coming in.

The total deficit declined from \$3.9 billion in 1960 to \$2.4 billion in 1961 and \$2.2 billion in 1962. Then it rose to \$2.6 billion in 1963 and still further to around \$2.8 billion in 1964. Nearly half of this, or \$1.3 billion, was reported for the final quarter.

Governmental Programs: The Administration has advanced various proposals for holding down the deficit and reversing it. In 1963 it put through an interest equalization tax to discourage purchases by Americans of new securities issued by foreign nations in the U.S. capital market. Then in 1965 it called for various voluntary programs for moderating bank lending and corporate direct foreign investment. It started a campaign to discourage tourism by Americans abroad and other transactions that would tend to drain off dollars and gold to other lands.

In a White House meeting with several hundred corporate executives on Feb. 18, 1965, Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor said "our payments position is acute," and "if we are to maintain our position in the world—both our political and our economic position—we must ask you to do more." He called for expanded exports, avoiding or postponing of investments in developing countries and a long list of other items in his "voluntary cooperative program."

While demanding restraint in the private lending and investment area the Administration, for the most part, has not put its finger on the cold war cause of the deficit. It has merely mentioned vaguely the possibility of some cutbacks in the overseas costs of defense and aid operations. However, the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, in its 1965 report on the President's Economic Report, urged "that the review of Government expenditures abroad focus particularly on the possibility of reducing troop commitments in Europe. . . . We must reduce our military expenditures in these countries—especially in countries such as France and Spain, which have refused to enter into offset arrangements of the type we have with Italy. Such arrangements reduce the balance-of-

payments impact of our overseas expenditures through increased purchases by our partners of U.S. military equipment and supplies."

No mention is made, however, of the big drain of the war then in progress against the people of Vietnam which amounted to about one-half of the total military expenditures abroad.

Military Drain: U.S. military expenditures overseas in all countries combined averaged around \$3 billion annually in the years 1959 through 1962, reached about \$2.9 billion in 1963 and were down only to around \$2.8 billion in 1964. A comparison with the total deficit in the balance of payments will show that such military expenditures alone were a little larger than the deficit. Thus in 1964 the military outlays abroad came to \$2,807 million while the balance of payments deficit was \$2,761 million.

U.S. business took varying attitudes toward the Administration's call for voluntary action. Some thought that interest rates should have been raised which of course could have set back the domestic economy and meant the loss of jobs for hundreds of thousands. A few even suggested moderate cutbacks in military and foreign aid spending abroad.

The *Wall Street Journal*, Feb. 15, 1965, said the government could help cure its balance-of-payments troubles if it would put some restraint on its own "outpourings of funds abroad." And the N.Y. *Herald Tribune*, Feb. 11, 1965, admitted that, "Boiled down to its lowest common denominator, the United States balance of payments deficit is the dollar price the nation pays to wage the cold war." It then explained: "But because U.S. leaders believe the cold war must be pursued, President Johnson has indicated the government will reduce the international payments deficit by curbing dollar outflow from private sources and some government aid programs."

Burden on Workers: One reason the Administration is opposed to an increase in minimum wages is because of its possible adverse effects on the balance of payments. It fears that it might be reflected in higher cost of goods at home and render U.S. goods less competitive in foreign markets.

In its call for wage "stability" and its opposition to shorter hours of work the government is thus in effect telling the American workers that they must pay the price for the foreign bases and the foreign military expenditures which are the crucial factor in the continuing balance of payments deficit.

One fact is as true today as it was when stated in our *Labor Fact Book 16*: "As long as the cold war is waged, with its huge outlays for military bases abroad, the balance of payments deficit is likely to persist," and to contribute to rising unemployment in the U.S. economy.

II. LABOR AND SOCIAL CONDITIONS

INCOME DISTRIBUTION

A total of 58,700,000 families and unattached individuals in the U.S. in 1963 were listed by the Department of Commerce in its annual report on distribution of income. It showed that in that year 6,700,000 families, or 11% of all, received income of less than \$2,000. But at the top of the income scale were 4,600,000 families, or 8% of all, each with income in that year of \$15,000 and over.

The term family as used by the Commerce Department in these estimates refers to consumer units—families of two or more as well as single persons living alone. The latest report estimates that in 1963 half of all the families in the U.S. received less than \$6,140 (the median) while half had more than that amount.

Grouped cumulatively the figures indicate roughly the distribution of income in 1963:

6,700,000 (11%)	received less than \$	2,000
16,900,000 (29%)	" " "	4,000
28,600,000 (49%)	" " "	6,000
39,200,000 (67%)	" " "	8,000
46,400,000 (79%)	" " "	10,000
12,300,000 (21%)	"	\$10,000 and over
4,600,000 (8%)	"	\$15,000 and over

Family Personal Income: The Department of Commerce reports each year on the income of consumer units, ranked by income in quintiles or fifths. These figures show how family personal income was distributed in the year 1962 (latest available).

The lowest fifth of the families in 1962 thus had less than 5% (4.6%) of the total family personal income. But the highest fifth had 45.5% of the total.

In dollars, the lowest fifth had an average (mean) of only \$1,662, while the highest fifth had an average of \$16,505. The top 5% received 19.6% of the total income with an average of \$28,482.

PERCENT OF FAMILY PERSONAL INCOME RECEIVED
BY EACH FIFTH OF CONSUMER UNITS

<i>Fifths</i> (ranked by income)	<i>Percent</i> <i>distribution</i>	<i>Mean</i> <i>family income*</i>
Lowest 20%	4.6	\$1,662
Second 20%	10.9	3,966
Third 20%	16.3	5,938
Fourth 20%	22.7	8,241
Highest 20%	45.5	16,505
	100%	
Top 5%	19.6	28,482

* Intermediate or average.

POVERTY IN THE UNITED STATES

There is no precise way to measure the number of families in the U.S. who do not have the resources to provide minimum satisfaction of their needs. This was the conclusion of the Annual Report of the Council of Economic Advisers (CEA) submitted to Congress in Jan. 1964. Drawing a line for a family of 4 at \$3,000 a year (before taxes and expressed in 1962 prices) the Council found that a family falling below that line is "poor" and not able to maintain a decent standard of living.

Using this definition of poverty in a new study, *Progress or Poverty: The U.S. At the Crossroads*, Leon H. Keyserling, former Chairman of the CEA, found that in 1963 in the U.S. the number of families living in poverty with incomes under \$3,000 (measured in 1962 dollars) was 8.9 million, or an estimated 29.2 million people. The number of unattached individuals living in poverty, with incomes under \$1,500, was 5 million. Total number of people living in poverty thus came to 34.2 million, or between a fifth and sixth of the nation.

He reported that in 1963 the number of families with incomes under \$2,000 was 5.1 million, or about 16.7 million people. And the number of unattached individuals with incomes under \$1,000 was 3.2 million. Thus, almost 20 million people, or substantially more than a tenth of the nation, were at least 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ % below the income levels needed to lift them out of the poverty cellar.

None of the data just cited, Keyserling adds, convey the full meaning of poverty. "For the *average* income of all families 'under \$3,000' in 1963 was only \$1,778; the *average* for all families 'under \$2,000' was only \$1,220; the *average* for the 1.8 million families 'under \$1,000' was only \$630."

The one universal characteristic of all the poor is that they do not receive enough income in money and other forms to rise above poverty, Keyserling explains. "Only programs which increase their incomes can reduce poverty."

The CEA's Annual Report estimated that families living in poverty in 1962 included over 11 million children, or one-sixth of the youth in the U.S. (A year later, in its 1965 Report, the CEA raised this number to 15 million children, stating, "This means that one-fourth of the Nation's children live in families that are poor.")

About 14 million women, 16 years of age and over, are in the families living in poverty, the U.S. Women's Bureau reported (Jan. 11, 1965).

Nearly one-half of all nonwhites in the U.S. live in poverty, the CEA report estimated. Some 44% of all Negro families have incomes of less than \$3,000 a year.

About 43% of all farm families are poor, while more than 80% of non-white farm families live in poverty.

There are more than 4.2 million old people living alone on an annual income of less than \$1,500. More than 3 million unattached persons, most of them elderly, had incomes below \$1,000 in 1962.

The CEA said that the poor inhabit "a world where Americans are literally concerned with day-to-day survival—a roof over their heads, where the next meal is coming from. It is a world where a minor illness is a major tragedy, where pride and privacy must be sacrificed to get help."

In the Midst of Plenty: In his book, *In the Midst of Plenty: The Poor in America*, Ben H. Bagdikian similarly estimates that one in 5 Americans live below the minimum standards of food, shelter and medical care. On the basis of Census figures for the number of persons living on strictly cash income, he finds that 36 million persons are poor, slightly higher than the figures given above. They are living on less than \$3,000 a year.

His figure for children is lower than the 1965 CEA estimate. He says that in the families of the poor there are some 12 million children, who have "inherited a bleak and hopeless outlook which for most of them already has poisoned the education that could save them."

He agrees with other reporters on poverty that Negroes are especially hard hit, with an unemployment rate twice that of whites. Those who do work get 7% fewer working hours and 40% lower wages. "Regardless of their income, the vast majority of Negroes are excluded from the normal housing market, the primary benefit for most families who improve their wages."

Three Levels of Poverty: In a study of poverty in America, issued in 1964, the National Policy Committee on Pockets of Poverty reported the results of a 3-year investigation by Dr. Oscar Ornati of the New School for Social Research in New York. It defined three levels of poverty in terms of cash income for a family of four in 1960, as follows: minimum of subsistence, \$2,500 a year; minimum of adequacy, \$3,500 a year; minimum of comfort, \$5,500. It found 20 million persons in

families below the subsistence level, some 46 million in those below adequacy levels, and 70 million below the comfort level.

Prof. Ornati in the same report points out that the government figures used by the CEA and others tend to exaggerate the decline in poverty over the years because they use the 1947 yardstick of substandard income as the basis for estimating poverty both in 1947 and in later years. He says that what should be compared "is the number who lived 'below adequacy' in 1947 by 1947 standards of adequacy with those who lived 'below adequacy' in 1960 by 1960 standards. When this is done, we find the number of abject poor, the number of those living 'below adequacy' and below minimum comfort levels have not changed very much. In 1947, by 1947 standards, 27% of all people lived below levels of minimum adequacy and in 1960, by 1960 standards, they amounted to 26%. The 1947 proportion living below minimum comfort was 39% while in 1960 it was 40%."

Living in Deprivation: In his study cited above, *Progress or Poverty*, Leon Keyserling also makes an estimate of those he classifies as living in "deprivation." The number has declined only a little since his former estimate of those in this category given in *Labor Fact Book* 16. He now considers conservatively that families with incomes below \$5,000 but above the poverty level, and unattached individuals with incomes of below \$2,500 but above the poverty level, are living in deprivation, especially as their *average* income falls very far below \$5,000 and \$2,500 respectively.

So he figures that in 1963 there were 8.6 million families with an estimated 30 million people and 1.9 million unattached individuals who lived in deprivation: "a total of 32 million, or more than a sixth of a nation." Adding those living in poverty, he finds that more than 66 million people, or about 35½% of the U.S. population, lived either in poverty or deprivation in 1963.

In Appalachia: The Appalachian mountain region that stretches through 11 states from eastern Pennsylvania south to Alabama, known officially as Appalachia, is now called the nation's "worst pocket of poverty." It contains "some rural slums as despairing as anything one might encounter in Europe . . . the region as a whole is marked by high unemployment and a declining population." A bill to give some aid to the region failed in Congress in 1964 but a similar one, with a \$1 billion authorization, was passed in 1965.

About a third of the people who live in the area are poor. "Nearly a third of the 3.8 million families in Appalachia earn less than \$3,000 a year. . . . The residents of many towns in Appalachia are often elderly persons living on Social Security, pensions or relief." In eastern Kentucky, many are "without shoes for their children's feet."

After a special survey of Appalachia, *N.Y. Times* reporter Marjorie

Hunter (May 3 and 4, 1964) described it as a chronically depressed area where the full-time unemployment rate in 1964 was 7.9% while the national rate was 5.7%. But she reported that there are so many hidden unemployed (those who have ceased trying to find work) that the actual rate of unemployment in Appalachia is estimated by federal officials to be much higher.

She describes a village called Happy Hollow in which no one has a full-time job. All the families receive "commodities," the surplus food that the government provides to the needy. The village is in a county where about 30% of the work force is unemployed. Men who once worked in the mines or sawmills can no longer find jobs of any kind. (See also pamphlet *Appalachia, U.S.A.: A Study in Poverty*, by George Meyers.)

Cause of Death: At the annual meeting of the American Public Health Association, Oct. 9, 1964, New York City Health Commissioner, Dr. George James, reported that "poverty is the third leading cause of death" in this area. He said that 13,000 deaths a year in New York City resulted from conditions of poverty in which 1,400,000 New Yorkers, or one-fifth of the city's population are living.

Infant mortality, he reported, is 13.8 per 1,000 live births in Flushing, N.Y., a middle-class area, but 27 per 1,000 births in the Bedford-Stuyvesant district of Brooklyn, a poor section roughly one-third white and the rest Negro and Puerto Rican. Citing other figures on deaths from other categories of illness, Dr. James reported: "It is no exaggeration to say that these deaths are caused by poverty. . . . For these dreadful figures of unnecessary deaths, poverty is the common denominator." (*N.Y. Times*, Oct. 10, 1964.)

First Step: The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 was a modest and inadequate first step with the purpose officially described as an effort to mobilize "the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States." Stating that it is the policy of the U.S. to eliminate the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty, it seeks to open "to everyone the opportunity for education and training, the opportunity to work, and the opportunity to live in decency and dignity. It is the purpose of this Act to strengthen, supplement and coordinate efforts in furtherance of that policy."

The Act embodies very limited and insufficient programs for education and training of youth, for urban and rural community action; special programs to combat poverty in rural areas; employment and investment incentives; and a program for "family unity through jobs."

A new Office of Employment Opportunity, headed by Sargent Shriver, was established in 1964, with a request to Congress for an appropriation of \$962.5 million to attack poverty. Congress allocated \$800 million for the first year to implement the Act and various projects were being

authorized in 1965. The cost of the second year's operations was to be about \$1.5 billion.

Limited Program: In his recent book, *Poverty: Its Roots and Its Future* (International Publishers, 1965), Dr. Hyman Lumer finds the Administration's program much too limited in scope. "In relation to the needs and challenges of the anti-poverty crusade, the Johnson Administration's program is glaringly insufficient. Having raised the banners of 'unconditional war' the Administration has come forward with an arsenal of weapons scarcely adequate for the first skirmish."

And aside from its other deficiencies, Lumer adds, "the program is entirely lacking in two fundamental respects. First, it includes no provision for creating jobs. . . . Second, it completely ignores the focal question of Negro poverty. As long as it fails to come to grips with such questions, and as long as it is based on concepts of minimal expenditures, the Administration's anti-poverty program is bound to remain peripheral."

The amounts involved are insignificant in relation to the size of the problem. As Lumer suggests, "Certainly it would be no exaggeration to think in terms of annual outlays of the order of \$25 billion or more."

This amount would be less than half the "mountainous military expenditures" of the U.S. today which, in fact, are "the chief obstacle to the waging of a full-scale war on poverty."

Lumer concludes: "The simple fact is that big business is for military spending because it is profitable and against spending for social welfare because it is not. An equally simple fact is that the interests of the American working people lie in exactly the opposite direction."

Poverty and Arms Spending: Similar arguments are now beginning to come from trade union organizations as they contrast the billions spent for the cold war and "limited wars" with the minor amounts allocated for the anti-poverty campaigns. A good summary of this position appeared in *News and Views*, official organ of the Ohio AFL-CIO (Jan. 15, 1965) under the simple heading, "Facts and Figures." It said:

"President Johnson recently gave the go-ahead to spend \$750 million to develop a gigantic new military transport plane. The story on the announcement also stated that the Government planned "to spend in excess of \$1 billion to build three squadrons of the new transport." That's a total of nearly \$2 billion.

"The amount earmarked for the war on poverty last year by Congress was \$784 million. In his State of the Union Message, President Johnson said he would recommend doubling the war against poverty this year. That would mean about \$1.5 billion. The President also proposed a \$1.5 billion program of aid to students and schools.

"The Government spends about \$6 billion a year on military research

alone. (The Pentagon plans to spend \$13.5 billion on arms and equipment in the next fiscal year.)

"The American Telephone & Telegraph Company's Bell Telephone system reported an all-time record net profit for any company of \$1.7 billion last year.

"In summary: The Government will spend more to develop a military transport plane than it was willing to earmark for the anti-poverty program last year;

"It will spend more to develop the plane and build three squadrons of it than it will be asked to appropriate for the poverty war this year;

"The amount to be proposed for the assistance of schools and students will amount to one-fourth of what the Government spends on military research;

"The net profit of one American company for one year is more than the Government will be asked to appropriate to eliminate poverty across the entire country."

LOW INCOMES IN SOUTH

Figures on personal income show the states of the South to be well below the national average. These figures from the *Survey of Current Business* of the U.S. Department of Commerce April 1965 show that in 1963 the lowest incomes were reported for Mississippi and Arkansas. The former had an average of only \$1,392 compared with a national average of \$2,448; Arkansas had \$1,570. The Southeastern states as a group had a per capita average of only \$1,814. Here are the states in this group ranging from the lowest to the highest :

Mississippi	\$1,392	Louisiana	\$1,778
Arkansas	1,570	North Carolina	1,797
South Carolina	1,575	Georgia	1,829
Alabama	1,640	West Virginia	1,847
Tennessee	1,758	Virginia	2,080
Kentucky	1,774	Florida	2,157

For per capita disposable income the figures were of course lower as this is after taxes are deducted. Here the range was from \$1,266 in Mississippi to \$1,905 in Florida. For the Southeast groups of states as a whole the average was \$1,604 compared with a national average of \$2,122.

The states of highest per capita personal income, both before and after taxes, are Nevada (\$3,203 before taxes) and Delaware (\$3,271 before taxes). In the former state the vast gambling industry raises the average and in Delaware the fabulous income of the DuPont family which bulks large in a state with a relatively small population.

CITY WORKER'S FAMILY NEEDS

The average American worker now needs \$123 a week to provide just "the necessities of life" for a family of 4. For the 52 weeks of the year this comes to \$6,418.

This amount is needed to provide the family with a "modest but adequate" standard of living in American cities. It leaves nothing for luxuries or savings. This figure represents a revision of the Labor Department's City Worker's Family Budget last issued in 1959 and referred to in earlier numbers of *Labor Fact Book*.

This budget measures the income needed by a family of 4 (an employed husband, age 38, a wife not employed outside the home, and 2 children of school age, a boy of 13 and a girl of 8) who live in a rented dwelling in a large city or suburb, to buy all goods and services required for what the Department of Labor describes as a "level of adequate living according to standards prevailing in large cities of the United States in recent years." (AFL-CIO *Federationist*, May 1965.)

Priced in 20 Cities: Averaging prices for 20 major cities in the autumn of 1964, the AFL-CIO Department of Research found this City Worker's Family Budget required for food \$1,899; housing, \$1,441; clothing, \$581; medical care, \$365; transportation, \$491; other goods and services, \$764; other costs, \$322; and personal taxes, \$555.

The cost of the budget as thus updated to 1964 ranged from \$5,577 (\$107 a week) in Houston, Texas, to \$6,900 (\$133 a week) in Seattle, Wash. The variation from city to city was mainly the result of differences in the cost of housing (rent and utilities).

Earnings Below Budget: Average earnings of factory workers at the beginning of 1965 were far below the amount needed for the budget standard. Straight-time earnings in Jan. 1965 were \$2.58 an hour. The worker would need to earn \$3.07 an hour to meet the amount necessary for a family of 4 on this budget.

The average factory worker's weekly income was thus about \$18 a week too low to meet this budget. And if he does not work full time throughout the year, he is even further behind the minimum needed for it.

In the retail trades the worker is in a worse position than the factory worker. In Jan. 1965 he earned an average of only \$70.13 a week or about \$53 a week short of the \$123 budget requirement.

It is clear from this latest report that millions of American workers, skilled as well as unskilled, fail to earn the amount needed to maintain a minimum adequate standard of living for a family of 4 at current prices.

REAL EARNINGS OF FACTORY WORKERS

The "real" spendable weekly earnings of factory workers in manufacturing industries are calculated monthly by the U.S. Department of Labor. It shows the worker's buying power after deducting social security payments and income taxes from his gross average weekly earnings and adjusting the results by the Department's consumer price index.

In the year 1964, the factory worker with no dependents earned an average of \$78.08 a week in stable (1957-59) dollars. This net spendable average weekly pay compared with an average of \$74.81 in the year 1963—showing a gain of \$3.27, or about 4.4%.

The factory worker with 3 dependents earned an average of \$85.27 a week in the year 1964 in terms of 1957-59 dollars. This compared with \$82.08 in 1963, a gain of \$3.19 a week, or about 3.9% over 1963.

In hourly earnings, when overtime earnings are excluded, production workers in manufacturing averaged only \$2.44 an hour in the year 1964. This was an increase of only 7¢ above the 1963 average of \$2.37. It indicated a small increase of around 3% in average hourly earnings.

WOMEN WORKERS

Women are forming an increasingly important part of the U.S. labor force. By Aug. 1964 some 25,900,000 women, or more than one out of three (37%), of those over 14 years were paid workers and they constituted about one-third (33%) of the total number of workers.

More than two-fifths (42%) of the single women in the U.S., but only one-third of the married women with husbands present, were in the labor force in March 1962. But nearly one-half (49%) of married women whose husbands were absent were at work for pay.

Both husband and wife were working in almost one-third of the married couples reported in March 1962. This proportion may be compared with the data for 1940, just before World War II, when in only about one-ninth of the married couples were both husband and wife in the labor force. It was much less customary then for the wife to work. In general, the higher the husband's income the less the probability that the wife will work. Most of the married working women have no children of school age.

Nearly a third of all employed women are clerks, stenographers or secretaries. The number of women employed as domestic workers in private families has greatly declined. In 1961 there was only one domestic worker to 24 households, whereas in 1900 there was one domestic worker, on the average, to every 11 households.

Occupations in 1960 in which women constituted nine-tenths or more of the total number of workers included professional nurses, babysitters,

secretaries, private household workers, telephone operators, stenographers, typists, sewers and stitchers in factories.

Earn Less: For workers who were year-round full-time workers, with work experience the average income in 1960 was \$2,531 for women but \$4,919 for men. The median income of all women and girls who had full or part-time work in 1960 was \$1,829; for men and boys the median was \$4,500.

Equal Pay Act: In June 1963 Congress passed the Equal Pay Act. It was enacted to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce. It includes all employees who are covered by the minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The Equal Pay Act, which requires equalization of wage rates for men and women doing equal work, is estimated to cover nearly 7 million working women. But there are exemptions, for all of the Fair Labor Standards Act exemptions apply. Excluded are workers in agriculture, hotels, motels, restaurants and laundries, as well as all professional, managerial and administrative personnel and outside sales people.

Shortly before this Act went into effect the *Wall Street Journal* (April 16, 1964) reported that, "Some companies will avoid paying increases by reassigning men and women to separate job categories."

JOBLESS YOUNG WORKERS

"The extremely high unemployment rates for teenagers and young adults represent a serious problem now, with even more serious implications for the future." This is the conclusion of the U.S. Department of Labor in its Manpower Report submitted by President Johnson to Congress in March 1965.

It said that "for many young people, especially those living in low-income households and those who are married, unemployment is associated with want. This is a particularly serious problem among young nonwhite workers." Also, "the trends in both manpower demand and supply for the immediate future imply an aggravation rather than an easing of these problems. A vast increase in the number of young workers will be occurring in the face of a relatively slow growth in the less skilled jobs typically available to them. These trends may imply a growing problem of unemployment for young adult workers in the future."

Highest Unemployment Rate: Figures included in this report indicate that for youths of 16 through 24 the full-time unemployment rate in 1964 was 11.5% compared with a national rate of 5.2% for all ages combined. Thus the youth rate is more than double the average unemployment rate for the work force as a whole.

In this age bracket in 1964 there were about 1.5 million jobless. Al-

though these young workers made up less than 20% of the labor force they accounted for more than 40% of the nation's full-time unemployment.

Using these figures and others from the Department of Labor, the research division of AFL-CIO in *The Federationist* (May 1965) pointed out that in 1965 there would be more than 2.5 million young men and women entering the work force for the first time. And by 1970 they will be coming in at the rate of 3 million a year, compared with an average of about 2 million in the 1950s.

In addition to those counted as full-time unemployed are those young people forced to work part-time because they cannot find full-time jobs, and also those who have given up looking for work because they have become discouraged. In recent years about 400,000 young people in the 18-24 group have been forced to work part-time in non-farm industries because they could not find full-time work. The AFL-CIO economists estimate that when these categories are added, the number of youth between 18 and 24 out of work in 1964 would total upwards of 2 million.

After discussing the various legislation passed in recent years to raise the skills and education of young workers, they conclude: "The missing link in the whole chain—for school graduates and for school dropouts, for the whites and the nonwhites, for boys and for girls—is jobs. And it is not only jobs for youth, but for adults as well. Without job opportunities to meet the needs of the entire labor force, none of the other programs that seek to deal with the problems of young people in the job market can be very effective."

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Unemployment insurance is not meeting the needs of the unemployed. At present it is compensating about 1 out of every 5 dollars that workers lose through joblessness.

Leon Keyserling, in his *Poverty and Progress*, noted that as of June 1964 "only slightly more than a quarter" of the 4.7 million then reported unemployed, received benefits under State programs and programs covering Federal workers.

The AFL-CIO Legislative Department in a Fact Sheet on unemployment compensation (No. 9) reported: "Some state programs offer no more than a token pittance to jobless workers. Those who do get benefits receive amounts of only one-third of their weekly loss, some as little as one-fourth or one-fifth."

Low Benefits: In 1963 the average unemployed benefit for all states combined was 36% of the average covered wage. The proportion ranged from 48% down to as little as 25%. This is far below the average originally planned when the state-federal system of unemploy-

ment compensation laws was first introduced. The goal then was two-thirds of a state's average wages. But no state has as yet met that standard.

The average weekly benefit for total unemployment for the country as a whole in 1963 was \$35.28 and for Dec. 1964 it was \$36.81. The lowest payments were of course reported in states with the lowest wage scales. For example, in Mississippi the average was \$24.56; in North Carolina it was \$23.32 and in West Virginia \$24.65.

The benefits under the various state laws are payable for a maximum number of weeks ranging at present from 22 to 39. In 39 states it is only 26 weeks, and it is 24 or less in 4 states.

Union Proposals: Programs for improvement have been advanced by trade unions and others. They have been pressing for a comprehensive overhaul and improvement of the system under a single federal program which will provide amounts and duration adequate to enable workers to maintain decent living standards.

Pending the establishment of such a system they have pressed for the enactment of the McCarthy-King Bill, as it was called in the 88th Congress. This would provide for extension of coverage to 3 million or more persons; those working in small establishments with one or more employees as well as workers in charitable, educational and humane organizations. It provides also for payment of federal unemployment adjustment benefits from the 27th week up to the 52nd week of unemployment for all those who have exhausted state benefits and fulfilled other conditions.

It calls also for federal standard or requirement that state benefits must provide at least half the worker's lost weekly wage subject to a statewide maximum that will rise progressively until eventually it would be two-thirds of each state's average weekly wage.

In May 1965 President Johnson proposed a general jobless pay overhaul which included some of the demands of the unions. He called for it on the ground that it would, among other things, help "to exert a stronger stabilizing effect on the economy."

A complete and up-to-date analysis of the latest figures and the contents of the McCarthy-Mills Bill, as the Administration's measure was called in the 89th Congress, was included in an article, "A New Role for Unemployment Insurance," in the *American Federationist*, June 1965.

MINIMUM WAGE LEGISLATION

Under the federal Fair Labor Standards Act the minimum wage was raised to \$1.25 an hour in 1964. Although there have been improvements over the years the present minimum wage protection has been sharply criticized.

AFL-CIO considers the \$1.25 hourly minimum inadequate and is calling for a \$2 minimum. Labor agrees with the finding of Leon H. Keyserling in his study, *Progress or Poverty*, that "among the 44 million wage and salary earners who should certainly be accorded minimum wage protection under federal or state laws or both, only 29 million are covered."

He points out that the federal law now covers only 80% of those in construction; only about 75% in wholesale trade, finance, insurance and real estate; "only about 35% in retail trade; only about 15% in the services, and none of those in agriculture."

As for the state laws there were none in effect in 20 states at the end of 1964, and in only 15 states where there are any such laws did they cover both men and women. Coverage was generally limited to women and children in a few industries.

Sweat Shop Wages: Among workers not covered by the federal law, Keyserling notes that "about one-fifth of the 1.5 million nonsupervisory workers in restaurants and other food service enterprises are paid less than 75¢ an hour; nearly 10% of the almost half a million nonsupervisory workers in hotels and motels are paid less than 50¢ an hour; more than half of the laundry workers among the more than half a million nonsupervisory laundry and cleaning workers are paid less than \$1.25 an hour, and about 8% less than 75¢ an hour. A quarter of the approximately 700 thousand nonsupervisory nonprofessional workers employed in nongovernmental hospitals appear to be paid less than \$1.25 an hour, and many of them are as poorly paid as the lowest paid workers in restaurants, hotels and laundries." (The even lower paid farm workers are discussed elsewhere in this chapter.)

He estimates also that in the overall, about 12 million American workers earn less than \$1.50 and that at least one million earn less than 50¢ an hour.

The present \$1.25 federal standard means an annual income of only about \$2,500 to a worker fully employed through the year, which is about \$500 below the \$3,000 required to lift a family above the poverty level "aside from the unemployment suffered during a year by millions of workers which prevents them from earning \$2,500 per year even if they earn \$1.25 an hour. And what sort of a 'goal' is even \$3,000 a year, when the *average* family requirement for a 'minimum but adequate' budget is about \$6,000?"

Progress in New York: The minimum wage in New York State was increased Oct. 1, 1964, from \$1.15 an hour to \$1.25 an hour, as required under the federal law. Among persons excluded from the law, however, are domestic workers in the home of the employer, laborers on a farm; executive, administrative and professional workers; outside salesmen, taxicab drivers, and special groups employed in non-profit, religious or charitable institutions.

In New York City a minimum wage of \$1.50 an hour went into effect Sept. 1, 1964. It was opposed by the Commerce & Industry Ass'n which said it would make New York City a "noncompetitive high-wage island," and would hasten the exodus of manufacturing concerns from the city.

On the other hand, the New York Central Labor Council said that the \$1.50 minimum would "mean meat on the table for some low-paid workers," and would especially help many low-income workers now receiving aid from the city Welfare Department.

Union Support: United Automobile Workers at its 1964 convention called for "achievement of the national goal of a job at decent pay (a minimum wage of at least \$2 an hour) for all Americans who are able to work and are seeking work." It also urged broadening the federal Fair Labor Standards Act to cover all possible workers and an increase in its minimum wage level. It said: "The present coverage and wage standards are far too meager to properly safeguard against poverty income for low-wage workers."

The \$1.25 minimum helped few unionized workers, the *IUD Bulletin*, organ of the Industrial Union Dept. (AFL-CIO), pointed out (Jan. 1964) in an article, "Case for \$2 Minimum Wage." When the \$2 minimum is achieved it will help also those industries now only partially organized. "But the main thrust of any minimum wage improvement will be to lift up those without bargaining strength and union representation."

WORK INJURIES AND DEATHS

For the first time since 1953 the number of workers disabled in work accidents in the U.S. rose in 1963 above the 2 million level to 2,020,000. This was an increase of 1.5% above 1962. (Estimates by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics in collaboration with the National Safety Council.)

Number of workers killed in industrial accidents in 1963 totaled 14,200—a rise of 3.6% over 1962. The death rate, however, was at a record low of 21 per 100,000 workers. In agriculture, the number of deaths in work accidents in 1963 rose to 3,300 compared with 3,100 in 1962.

In 1964: There was a further rise in total number disabled in work accidents in 1964. Preliminary estimate was 2,050,000—about 30,000 more than in 1963. Number killed in on-the-job injuries totaled 14,200, as high as in 1963.

This was the first time in 11 years that the volume of disabling work injuries remained above 2 million for 2 consecutive years. About 85,800 of those injured in 1964 experienced some degree of permanent disability.

Agriculture was the only industry that showed a decrease in work

injuries—to 3,200, or a decline of 100 from 1963. In manufacturing there were fewer fatalities—1,700 as against 1,800 in 1963—but more injuries—429,000 compared with 405,000 the previous year. Contract construction showed an increase to 219,000—a rise of 5,000 over 1963. There were 2,600 deaths in construction compared with 2,500 the previous year.

Hazardous Coal Mines: Coal mining is still one of the most dangerous industries. The Federal Mine Safety Law of 1952 granted authority to federal mine inspectors to close down hazardous mines. But the measure has serious flaws because it exempts mines that employ 4 or fewer men underground. But Congress again on Aug. 17, 1964, turned down a bill to protect the lives of men working in these smaller operations.

In 1963 a total of 284 miners were killed in mine accidents, compared with a total of 287 in 1962, the U.S. Bureau of Mines reported.

On April 25, 1963, a methane-dust explosion in a mine of the Clinchfield Coal Co., near Sardis, West Va., killed 22 men instantly. They left 22 widows and 40 children under 18 years of age.

On Dec. 16, 1963, at a mine of the Carbon Fuel Co., Helper, Utah, 9 men died in a disaster resulting from ignition of methane gas and coal dust. The victims died from carbon monoxide poison and burns.

Fatalities in coal mines totaled 241 in 1964, a decline of 43 from 1963. Falls of roof are still the greatest single killer of coal miners, in 1964 causing about half the fatalities. In a small nonunion mine near Pikeville, Ky., on March 12, 1964, virtually the entire roof collapsed, killing 3 miners. They were working 800 feet underground at a mine of the Smith Coal Co.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION INADEQUATE

State workmen's compensation laws were originally intended to restore to an injured worker at least two-thirds of the wage lost due to industrial injury. Actually no state in the U.S. meets this standard. Because of this failure of the states, a federal compensation law has been urged by AFL-CIO and independent labor organizations.

The average state workmen's compensation benefit is between \$35 and \$45 a week. But wages of industrial workers are about \$100 a week. So an injured factory worker receiving as much as \$45 in weekly benefits would be getting less than half his regular earnings.

U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare has estimated that about 20% of the civilian wage and salary workers in the U.S. are not covered by workmen's compensation laws. Despite the fact that all states now have such laws, it is possible for some employers to evade the law.

An "elective" act permits an employer to accept or reject provisions

of the law and 24 states have such elective laws. In 27 states employers with less than a certain number of employees are exempt from coverage. Only 9 states and Puerto Rico cover farm workers in the same manner as other workers.

Occupational diseases are covered to some extent in all states except Mississippi and Wyoming but 19 states cover only certain occupational diseases specifically enumerated in the law.

Standards Outlined: AFL-CIO has outlined the standards which should be included in a good compensation law, as follows:

Compulsory coverage with no exemptions for establishments with a minimum number of employees. Coverage of farm workers in the same manner as other employees. Benefit levels high enough to maintain a decent standard of living for injured workers and their dependents, with maximum weekly benefits of not less than $\frac{2}{3}$ of the state's average weekly wage.

Also, reciprocity of benefit rights between jurisdictions. Full statutory coverage of all occupational diseases. Coverage of diseases caused by ionizing radiation. Full medical benefits for job-incurred personal injuries and occupational diseases. Full compensation protection under second injury funds. Maintenance benefits during rehabilitation. Administration under a state agency rather than the courts. Also, an exclusive state compensation fund. Benefits for the totally disabled for the full period of disability.

Federal Action Needed: With the exception of the exclusive state fund, all these standards have been recommended by the U.S. Department of Labor. There is still no state law that meets all the recommended standards. Only 2 jurisdictions, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia, meet as many as 9 of them. The AFL-CIO comments: "Unless there is action on the federal level, the nation's first social insurance is likely to remain last in terms of performance." (*American Federationist*, June 1963.)

The Auto Workers at its 1963 convention called the state laws "a fraud on the injured worker and his family," and said they "shockingly fail to accomplish" the purpose of providing income to "tide the injured worker's family over the period of disability."

Its resolution called for replacement "of at least a full 75% of wage loss to continue for the full period of disability or, in the case of survivors, for the full period of dependency."

SOCIAL SECURITY DEVELOPMENTS

Under the old-age, survivors and disability insurance provisions of the Social Security Act nearly 20 million elderly, retired or disabled persons during the fiscal year to June 30, 1964, received a total of about \$16 billion in cash benefits. For retired workers the old-age benefit paid (as

of Dec. 1964) averaged \$77.57 a month. For disabled workers the monthly benefit averaged \$91.12.

Other benefits paid (Dec. 1964) averaged as follows: for old-age assistance, \$78.90 a month; aid to families with dependent children (per recipient) \$33.85; aid to the blind, \$85.80; in general assistance (per case) \$68.60. Highest amount paid was for medical assistance to the aged, averaging \$194.69 in that month. This amount reflects the high cost of medical care.

1965 Changes: In the 89th Congress payments were increased by 7% for all recipients of every form of insurance and benefits under the Act retroactive to Jan. 1, 1965. This was effected in the same law that introduced medicare for those 65 years and over. (See below.)

The same Act raised the minimum benefits paid to a retired worker to \$44 a month. It also extended Social Security to self-employed physicians.

To finance the increase in benefits and the new medical care provisions, taxes were raised starting January 1966. The new rates will apply to the first \$6,600 of annual pay compared with \$4,800 at present.

At its 29th convention in Sept. 1964, the United Electrical Workers (UE) urged old age pensions for all elderly persons at age 60 with full benefits and at increased levels adequate to maintain decent living standards. Among its other proposals was a disability pension program to provide minimum decent existence for the total period of disability. And it continued also to urge the establishment of a single integrated federal system "guaranteeing all Americans cradle to the grave security against the hazards of illness, disability, work injuries, unemployment and old age."

UE stated that it supported such a comprehensive service "not only because of the shortcomings of the present Social Security law, but also because of the recent exposures disclosing how workers are daily being swindled under private pension plans that do not guarantee full cash vesting reserves."

INADEQUACIES OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

The rise in "welfare" cases or those on "relief" rolls between 1954 and 1964 was about 42%. This was in a decade when the population of the U.S. rose by only 18%. "Relief" costs, or public assistance funds expended, have risen to over \$5 billion a year, an increase of 90% in the decade. There are now about 8 million recipients of some form of public assistance.

Cases of aid to dependent children rose by more than 2 million in this decade reaching around 4 million, or doubling the number on relief.

We noted above the benefits paid under the several programs of "public assistance," administered by the states and localities and financed in part by federal funds granted to states under the Social Security Act.

The programs include those covering the aged, the blind, the permanently and totally disabled, and children whose needs arise from certain causes. The states may also receive grants for medical assistance to those aged persons not receiving old-age assistance and unable to take care of medical bills themselves. (An up-to-date picture of the inadequacies of the various forms of public assistance is given by Prof. Eveline M. Burns in "The Poor Need Money," *The Nation*, June 7, 1965.)

In Chicago Slums: A large proportion of welfare recipients are urban Negro slum-dwellers. "Contrary to popular opinion," says D. C. Cater, a Presbyterian minister who has been for 3 years a case worker with the Cook County, Ill., department of public aid, "only a small percentage of the males and single females who receive public aid are able-bodied and capable of holding jobs." (*Christian Century*, Feb. 24, 1965.) "And the majority of these would support themselves were they not caught in a wave of chronic unemployment wherein unskilled laborers simply cannot find jobs. Many of them were laid off by large industries which moved from the city or drastically reduced work forces because of automation."

He added: "By far the majority of the single persons on welfare are either indigents over 65 who receive Old Age Assistance or persons who get Disability Assistance because of physical inability to work."

Relief Recipient: In Chicago, he reports, "although living costs are skyhigh, the average person in these categories must live on a welfare grant of about \$40 a month (plus rent)." The \$40 includes about \$23 for food, plus \$5 for clothing, about \$9 for incidentals and \$3 for laundry.

Describing the plight of the relief recipient, he says "often he is physically unable to get to a supermarket and must buy high-priced food at neighborhood groceries. His poor health is aggravated by constant worry, and on his meager food allowance (officially figured at 78 cents per day) he cannot afford to buy foods which might improve his health. Society forces him to live in slums where he is in constant fear of attack and robbery, and then makes his life doubly miserable by the meagerness of his relief check."

Aid to Dependent Children: As in other cities Cater finds that in Chicago "The largest number of persons supported by public assistance are members of families who receive Aid to Dependent Children. Except in relatively few cases, the head of the 'A.D.C. family' is an unmarried mother or one who has been deserted by her husband. She has the tremendous responsibility of rearing her children under very difficult circumstances and on a meager budget. (On the average, in addition to rent, she receives about \$31 per month for herself, \$19 for each child under 6, \$27 for each child aged 6 to 12, and \$36 for each teen-ager.) . . . It is easy to see that one month's A.D.C. allowance is barely enough to last until the next check."

Cater continues: "I have been impressed with the sense of stigma

which most of these people feel simply because they receive aid. They are looked down upon and vilified by the entire community, Negro as well as white. . . . Most A.D.C. mothers would like to work, but it is extremely hard for them to find jobs which pay living wages or to make adequate child care arrangements. Sometimes they bring on physical and emotional exhaustion, with consequent illness, by pounding the pavements and scrimping on their food money to pay carfare and babysitters in vain efforts to find jobs." In most cases, the "only work they will be lucky enough to get will be domestic, restaurant or laundry jobs paying \$35 or \$45 a week. Of this amount an employed mother will have to pay \$15 or \$20 a week to a babysitter and her income will still have to be supplemented by A.D.C."

"GENERAL ASSISTANCE"

"General assistance" is a form of "welfare" or "relief" that is handled entirely by state and local governments and to which the federal government makes no contribution.

It is supposed to help those who do not qualify for the several forms of public assistance to which the federal government contributes. Some of its inadequacies are described by Elizabeth Wickenden in a chapter on "Welfare Services" in Joseph M. Becker's *In Aid to the Unemployed*. In most states it cannot be considered an adequate protection for need growing out of unemployment because of its spotty coverage, many exclusions, restrictive policies and low level of benefits.

A U.S. Senate study of the subject in 1959 found that 17 states made virtually no provisions for assistance to the employable unemployed. And in 18 states full financial responsibility for general assistance was left to the local political subdivisions, "with resulting inadequacy and unevenness."

It is difficult to estimate the number of persons receiving this form of local aid. But the Federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare estimated that in Dec. 1964 some 346,000 cases received "general assistance" averaging \$68.60 per case.

Miss Wickenden concludes that "general assistance . . . is so generally inadequate, restrictive and demeaning as to constitute an anachronism in modern welfare practice and philosophy." She notes that this type of assistance is perpetuated "by the absence of any federal provision for persons in need because of temporary disability or for unemployed workers without dependent children." (If there are children involved the public assistance aid described above is applicable.)

After a series of hearings, the U.S. Senate Special Committee on Unemployment Problems submitted in 1960 a report which included among its recommendations a proposal for federal financing participa-

tion in "general assistance." A similar suggestion was made the same year by the Advisory Council on Public Assistance appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. But no action was taken on the recommendations.

NEW YORK RELIEF SITUATION

In New York City the "relief" rolls have risen from around 280,000 in 1954 to over 500,000 in 1965 and are increasing by nearly 5,000 a month.

Over 6% of the population of the city is already receiving some form of public assistance and this includes some 300,000 children mostly living in crowded slums.

The public assistance grants made by the Welfare Department, says Commissioner of Welfare James Dumpson, "are below the nationally accepted poverty level now, which is \$3,000 for a family of four." (*N.Y. Herald Tribune*, Jan. 4, 1965.) "No family of 4 on public assistance in the Welfare Dept. receives \$3,000," Dumpson reports. He suggests a minimum of \$3,500 for such a family. He also advocates a "complete revision of the so-called means test" which, as presently applied, "puts a kind of stigma on being dependent," even though most often the dependency is not the fault of the individual.

Dumpson had earlier told the *Herald Tribune* (Nov. 1, 1964) that "Public assistance clients reflect inadequacies in our economy and social structure, not in themselves." And interviewed later by the *N.Y. Times* (Nov. 14, 1964) he said that the city was "fighting what at best is only a holding action against its welfare problem." He added, "if we are really serious about anti-poverty and reducing our welfare rolls, the \$900 million-plus in the Administration's anti-poverty bill is only a small drop in the bucket."

The *Herald Tribune*, in an article in its New York City in Crisis series (Jan. 31, 1965) said: "It is a city in which half a million people, more than the number living in the states of Alaska, Delaware, Nevada, Vermont or Wyoming, are now receiving welfare with no solution in sight. 'There is not a single thing we can do to keep this figure from increasing,' says one Welfare Department worker. For every case we close, another 3 or 4 are added to the rolls."

CONDITIONS OF THE ELDERLY

There are more than 18 million persons in the U.S. who have reached or passed their 65th birthday. About 3 million of them are still working, one-fourth of the men and a tenth of the women. About one in 20 of those in the labor force is looking for work.

About 16% of them have no income, 69% have an income ranging from \$1 to \$3,000, and 13% have incomes of from \$3,000 to \$10,000. Only 2% have incomes of \$10,000 or more.

Less than 30% of the nonmarried persons over 65 have assets of \$5,000 or more and over half have less than \$1,000. About 40% own their own homes. About 40% of the married couples have assets under \$1,000 and about 30% have assets (other than the home) of \$10,000 or more.

Congressional Action: In view of the increasing number of older people, legislative action relating to their needs has likewise increased in recent years as they have made their demands known to Congress through their organizations.

During the 1964 session of Congress approximately 160 bills relating to older persons were introduced but only about a dozen were passed. For the most part they were enacted as provisions of laws of wider scope. About half were in the form of liberalization of war veterans benefits.

Under the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which applies to all kinds of discrimination, the Secretary of Labor is directed to undertake a complete study of the problem of discrimination on account of age.

Congressional committee hearings in this period helped to publicize some of the difficult conditions affecting the aged, especially as consumers. These dealt, for example, with health frauds and quackery, and the interstate sale of real estate through advertising and mail order methods. Reports on these and other items were submitted by the Senate Special Committee on Aging. One of its subcommittees also reported on the Blue Cross and private health insurance of the elderly.

Housing Conditions: Although many older people own their own homes the condition of their housing is far below standard. *Aging* reported (Nov. 1964): "One out of every three American families headed by persons 65 years of age and over live in housing that is dilapidated, deteriorating, or lacking in certain necessary facilities."

After President Johnson had mentioned these conditions in his Special Message on Housing in 1964, some parts of the Housing Act of 1964 were aimed to help older people. Low rent public housing, home rehabilitation loans, relocation adjustment payments and other sections of the Act were expected to be of some benefit to senior citizens. The Act provides \$75 million for direct home loans to the elderly; also a program of relocation payments for families and elderly individuals displaced through an urban renewal program.

A bill to establish an Administration of Aging in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare was introduced in 1965. Entitled, "The Older Americans Act of 1965," it would also authorize a total of \$28.5 million in federal grants over a 3-year period to states and public and private agencies for research, training, community planning and other

projects related to aging. And it would create a new position of Commissioner on Aging to head the new Administration.

MEDICARE AND HEALTH INSURANCE

In his special message to Congress, Jan. 7, 1965, President Johnson noted that since World War II there has been increasing awareness of the fact that "the full value of Social Security would not be realized unless provision were made to deal with the problems of costs of illnesses among our older citizens."

He summarized the widely known facts underlying the need for a hospital insurance plan, for example, that "4 out of 5 persons 65 or older have a disability or chronic disease; people over 65 go to the hospital more frequently and stay twice as long as younger people; health costs for them are twice as high as for the young." Most of our elder people are not eligible under existing health insurance plans, and "almost half of the elderly have no health insurance at all." Furthermore, "The average retired couple cannot afford the cost of adequate protection under private health insurance."

The President asked that the Social Security system be extended to finance the cost of basic health services, so that "the specter of catastrophic hospital bills can be lifted from the lives of our older citizens."

1965 Medicare Law: The so-called "medicare" bill providing some health insurance to those 65 and over was passed by Congress and signed by the President in July 1965. Under the basic plan it extended the existing Social Security system to provide for hospitalization up to 90 days for each illness with the patient paying the first \$40, and after 60 days an additional \$10 a day; for nursing-home care up to 100 days (after at least 3 days in a hospital) with the patient paying \$5 for each day over 20; for home nursing services of up to 100 home visits after discharge from a hospital or extended care facility. And it provided for out-patient tests and diagnostic services on a cost-sharing basis with the patient paying the first \$20 and 20% of the remainder.

In addition the Act sets up a voluntary supplementary plan to cover doctor and other medical bills for those who pay \$3 a month. This includes physician care in hospital, office or home, as well as surgeon's services. It provides also for various services and supplies such as x-rays, radium therapy, laboratory tests, artificial legs, etc. And it covers up to 100 home nursing visits in a year in addition to those allowed under the basic plan and without the requirement of prior hospitalization. For this the patient pays the first \$50 of the annual costs plus 20% of the remaining expenses.

This was considered the most far-reaching improvement in the Social Security law since its enactment 30 years ago. Both the basic and the supplementary insurance benefits were to start July 1, 1966.

AMA Opposed: For years the reactionary American Medical Ass'n

has carried on multi-million dollar campaigns of propaganda against anything resembling the Medicare plan. In the meeting of its House of Delegates in Dec. 1964 it again rejected any compromise in its opposition. It considers the Kerr-Mills Act sufficient protection for the needs of the aged. But this provides nothing more than charity medical care, imposing a means test and offers meagre benefits varying from state to state and administered by state and local bodies.

Opposition of the AMA to medicare proposals is consistent with its past record. *Between the Lines*, The Wells Newsletter (Feb. 1, 1965), noted that "the AMA fights every inch of the way all efforts to establish in the U.S. health care and facilities that have long been regarded as standard in other modern countries. It should be kept in mind that the AMA speaks for commercial medicine and doctor-businessmen—it does not speak for its many dedicated doctor-members who are more concerned with the nation's health, with the science of healing, than with the economics of medicine."

Looking at the record of the organization, it adds: "For years the AMA opposed even *voluntary* health insurance; fought group health plans so ruthlessly that the Supreme Court eventually found the AMA guilty of conspiracy in restraint of trade. The AMA or its principal spokesmen have in the past opposed the American Red Cross blood bank; public venereal disease clinics; free diagnostic clinics for TB and cancer; Federal aid to state public health agencies. The AMA also attacked Social Security as a 'definite step towards either communism or totalitarianism.' In the 1930's and 40's the AMA charged that *voluntary* health insurance was 'socialism and communism,' that group medical practice bore the 'savor of communism,' that aid to maternal and child welfare care tended to 'promote communism'."

For National Health Insurance: In a strong argument for a compulsory tax-financed National Health Insurance program, James A. Kennedy, writing in *Labor Today* (Aug.-Sept. 1964), answered the AMA and others who attack socialized medicine: "As in nearly every other advanced society, socialist or capitalist, it remains the only rational and effective way of organizing medical care to benefit all the people. . . . Socialized medicine would make possible the ending of class distinctions and barriers in at least one area of social life."

"Both doctors and medical consumers have under socialized medicine the security and gratifying knowledge that the best medical care is available to every one," Kennedy shows. And recent studies which he quotes indicate that a majority of American workers do favor socialized medicine. The United Automobile Workers, for example, in 1964 again put on its agenda the fight for a compulsory National Health Insurance program for all Americans.

Such a program, covering all citizens and residents of the U.S., would be paid for either through present federal tax money now used for the

arms race, redirected to medicare, or by special health taxes. Such a program, Kennedy points out, has become or is becoming, the reality of medical life in Great Britain, the USSR, Sweden, People's China, Norway, Yugoslavia, Israel (through Histadrut), Denmark, and more than 50 other nations.

LIFE EXPECTANCY AND INFANT MORTALITY

It has often been asserted, especially by officials of the American Medical Ass'n, that the U.S. has the best medical care in the world and is therefore the "healthiest nation." This contention was challenged in Nov. 1963 by Dr. David D. Rutstein, director of the Harvard Medical School's department of preventive medicine. He cited two reliable measures in assessing effectiveness of health care in any nation: The expectancy of life at the time of birth for males and females, and the rate at which infants die immediately after birth and during the first year of life.

The infant mortality rate in the U.S. remained at 25.3 per 1,000 live births in both 1961 and 1962. While the U.S. has improved its infant mortality rate in the last decade, it has not done as well as a number of other nations. It dropped from 10th place in 1961 to 11th place in 1962.

The Netherlands and Sweden have the lowest infant mortality rates—15.3 deaths per 1,000 live births in 1962. In that year 8 other countries had better rates than the U.S. Ireland, which was in 13th place in 1961, has taken the 10th place that the U.S. had occupied in that year.

Shorter Life Expectancy for Negro Babies: Life expectancy at birth is an important indicator of the nation's health. For a Negro girl baby in the U.S. the life expectancy is 66 years. But for a white girl baby it is 74 years. For a Negro boy baby the expectancy is 61 years, while for a white boy baby it is 67 years. In New York City, the infant mortality figures show that white babies die at the rate of 21.4 per 1,000 live births, while the nonwhite death rate for babies is 40 per 1,000. This is roughly comparable to the figures for many southern states and for cities such as Washington and Chicago with large nonwhite populations. In most of the nation the infant mortality rate among nonwhite babies is roughly double the rate among whites. The nonwhite group includes also Puerto Ricans, Mexicans, American Indians and Orientals.

The poor showing of the U.S. in infant mortality rates is in large measure due to the economic and social deprivation among nonwhites. But even if the nonwhite population is excluded from the comparison, the Harvard report indicated, other nations are doing better than the U.S. in holding down infant mortality rates.

It was noted also in the Harvard study that Great Britain and Sweden

which do better than the U.S. in relation to life expectancy and infant mortality, both have socialized systems of medical care.

HOURS OF WORK

For production workers in manufacturing the workweek averaged 40.5 hours in the year 1964. For durable goods workers it was 41.3; for nondurable goods workers 39.6 hours.

In mining as a whole the workweek in 1964 averaged 41.6 hours, but for coal miners only 38.5. Industries with a longer-than-average workweek included highway and street construction, 42 hours; machinery, 41.8; transportation equipment, 42; paper and allied products, 42.7; railroad transportation, 42.9; and intercity and rural bus lines, 44.8.

Industries with a shorter-than-average workweek were: canned and preserved food (except meats), 38.3 hours; tobacco manufactures, 38.6; apparel and related products, 36.1; printing and publishing, 38.3; retail trade, 37.8; banking, 37.3.

Union Hours: The shorter workweek in the apparel and related industries, in the printing trades and certain other groups reflects the success of unions in winning shorter hours. Almost all (98%) of the printing trades workers have schedules of less than 40 hours a week, usually 37½-hour weeks. About 97% of the ladies garment workers, 65% of brewery workers, 15% of rubber workers, 13% of construction workers, and 12% of retail trades workers have schedules of fewer than 40 hours. Among office employees one-third are on schedules shorter than 40 hours.

By the end of 1964 about 8 million workers, or about 15% of all wage and salary employees, were working on full-time workweeks of less than 40 hours.

After the electricians in New York City won the 25-hour workweek in 1962, Theodore Kheel, the arbitrator, studied the results of the hours reduction. He found that some 800 to 1,000 new jobs resulted from the reduced workweek. Those jobs had gone mainly to new apprentices, provided under the agreement.

Brewery workers in almost all the major brewing centers of the U.S. are now on workweeks shorter than 40 hours. About 25,000, or nearly 65% of all in the brewery industry, are on schedules of 37½ hours or less a week. Millinery workers in all areas of the country now have a 35-hour week. Some rubber workers have long had a 36-hour workweek, a 6-hour day, 6-day week schedule.

The Hotel Trades Council in New York City gained a 35-hour week with 40 hours' pay effective in June 1964. In other areas hotel workers are on a 37½-hour week.

After a survey in 1963 the U.S. Department of Labor reported that

17% of full-time workers in restaurants were on standard schedules of less than 40 hours, and in laundries only 10%. In other surveys in 82 major cities in 1963-64, covering about 17 million plant and office workers, it found that 15%, or about one in seven, were on regular schedules of less than 40 hours. The largest proportion of both plant and office workers on schedules of less than 40 hours was in the Northeast. In 16 of the cities more than 10% of the industrial plant workers were on under-40-hour schedules. ("The Shorter Workweek Trend," *American Federationist*, Dec. 1964.)

Longer Weeks for Others: Although hours per week have declined in most occupational groups over the past decade, certain groups still show extra long weeks. For farm operators, for example, the workweek averaged 55 hours and for nonfarm managers and proprietors 50 hours in May 1963. These occupations include a high proportion of self-employed persons whose hours are not subject to regulation.

Some 22,700,000 workers, including farm workers, self-employed, and white-collar employees, in 1963 were working more than 40 hours a week. Of those on a longer workweek of 40 hours or more, about 2.4 million were on farms. About 1,250,000 government workers were among those working more than 48 hours a week.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reported, "The proportion of nonfarm wage and salary employees working over 48 hours has shown a persistent rise over the postwar period. This increase, while relatively small, is nevertheless significant because it runs counter to the general pattern of shorter scheduled workweeks in many sectors of the economy."

Argument for Fewer Hours: AFL-CIO maintains that in order to achieve the goal of full employment, the 35-hour week and double time for overtime work are both necessary. It estimates that a 35-hour week would create about 2.5 million new jobs. An article on "Shorter Hours to Create Jobs," in the *American Federationist* (April 1964) said: "It is time to move forward, by amending the Fair Labor Standards Act to establish a 35-hour workweek and double time pay for overtime work."

Labor argues that if an employer can work each employee only 35 instead of 40 hours a week, then he will hire more employees to make up the lost production. Women workers usually favor a shorter workweek with fewer daily hours so they can have more time to care for family and home.

Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, in its statement of policy on the shorter workweek (April 1963), said it favors the shorter workweek "as a partial answer to the problem of growing unemployment. . . . The ILWU pledges all-out support to any efforts made by the labor movement to cut back the workweek and open up job opportunities."

Moonlighting: There were some 3,700,000 "moonlighters" in May 1964, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reported, representing 5.2%

of the 71 million persons employed in the U.S. at that time. More than one quarter, 28.7% of all the moonlighting involved at least one job in agriculture. Moonlighting is defined as "taking a second job."

When the first survey of moonlighting was conducted in July 1956 there were 3,600,000 dual jobholders, or 5.5% of the employed workforce. During the 8-year period, 1956-1964, there had been an increase of about 100,000. In 1964 self-employed persons accounted for about 43% of the dual jobholders.

Several AFL-CIO affiliates which have experience with workweeks of less than 40 hours, for example in the garment, printing, brewery and baking industries, have not noticed any upturn in the number of members taking second jobs after their regular hours were cut.

If weekly pay is maintained when hours are reduced, comparatively few workers have sought a second job. But if reduction in hours brings lower weekly pay, some workers have sought a second job to maintain their former income and standard of living.

FARM WORKERS

There is a wide fluctuation in the number of hired farm workers employed on the nation's 3,300,000 farms at different times of the year. It now varies from some 750,000 in January to about 2,500,000 in September. Number in March 1965 totaled 971,000 or 10% less than in March 1964.

Average number of days worked by farm labor has fallen to less than 150 a year, not even half a year's work. In many labor camps the old description of a day's work as "from dawn to dusk" still applies.

Wage Rates and Income: For farm labor in the U.S. as a whole the average wage in April 1965 was only \$1.18 an hour, without board and room. (U.S. Department of Agriculture, *Farm Labor*, April 9, 1965.) Average per week, if board and room are provided, amounted to \$38.75. Without board and room the average in April 1965 was \$50.75. In one recent year farm workers in South Carolina averaged only 47¢ an hour.

These earnings contrast with those for production workers in manufacturing, which in Feb. 1965 averaged \$2.59 an hour or \$106.19 for a week of 41 hours. Factory workers' hourly and weekly earnings were thus more than double those of farm workers.

Secretary of Labor Wirtz announced in Jan. 1965 that minimum wage rates for farm labor after March 31, 1965, would range from \$1.40 an hour in California down to \$1.15 in Florida and other states. Minimums were fixed for 28 states. But farmers who do not import foreign labor will not have to meet the minimum. The federal Wage-Hour Act minimum does not apply to agriculture.

The big food growing companies in California and elsewhere called the \$1.40 an hour "far too high." Those protesting the rates included such profitable interests as California Packing Co., California Cannery & Growers, Hunt Foods, and Pacific Fruit Express.

Average income of hired farm workers in the U.S. does not exceed \$1,200 a year, including earnings from outside odd jobs, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics found in recent studies.

Migrant Workers: About one-fourth of the seasonal farm workers are migrants, moving from crop to crop. The importation of Mexican workers (*braceros*) ended on Dec. 31, 1964, when Public Law 78, permitting temporary, seasonal Mexican labor in the U.S. expired. This development cut off a flow of Mexican farm labor to California food growing companies. If a labor shortage was thus created the growers would have to raise wages and improve living and working conditions to attract domestic workers.

California had contracted for about half the 180,000 *braceros* who entered the U.S. in 1964. Others went as far north as Michigan's cucumber fields. Wirtz agreed in the spring of 1965 to let in some Japanese and Filipino labor for lemon picking in California, and 1,500 Mexican nationals to help harvest asparagus and strawberries.

Prevailing wage rate for migrants has been from 60¢ an hour in some vegetable operations to well over the 95¢-an-hour minimum for piece work harvesting in sugar fields and citrus groves. The U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor reported in 1965 that the average migrant worker's earnings in 1963 were only \$868, including \$211 from non-farm work.

Social Security law applies to a migrant worker only if within a single year he works 20 or more days on an hourly rate for one employer, or earns at least \$150 from one employer. Actually much of the migrants' work is piece-rate, over short periods of time, for many employers. Almost no migrants have unemployment insurance.

Housing: Migrant workers' housing conditions are notoriously bad in many areas. On his tour of Florida labor camps in 1965 Secretary Wirtz saw dilapidated wood shacks where double-decker bunks were crowded together to provide living quarters. Most workers were charged for housing as well as for meals. Typical family shacks, with only outside water taps and toilet, rented for \$12.36 a week.

Such conditions as these in some areas explain why growers in California still have difficulty recruiting farm labor, although there were over 400,000 unemployed in the state in the spring of 1965.

Proposals for improving conditions of migrant workers include extending the federal minimum wage to farm work and making unemployment insurance and workmen's compensation for migrants mandatory.

Union organization of farm workers has been tried several times without resulting in viable trade unions. The California AFL-CIO projected an organization campaign which began in the spring of 1965.

PUERTO RICANS IN U.S.

Puerto Ricans are American citizens but they share with many immigrant groups the disadvantages of language differences and "problems of low educational attainments," as described by the Manpower Report of the President (March 1964).

Some 893,000 residents of the continental U.S. were born in Puerto Rico or were the children of those born there, as counted by the 1960 Census. This was about 3 times the number so listed in 1950. Some 625,000, or about 70% of those in the U.S., live in or around the New York City area. The 1960 Census classified about 96% of the Puerto Ricans in the U.S. as of the white race.

In the New York City area about 317,000 Puerto Ricans are reported as in the labor force, mainly in the garment trades. About 40% of the men are operatives, while 25% are laborers in the low-wage service occupations. Only about 16% are in white-collar occupations, but only about 1 in 6 is in professional or technical work. About 11% are craftsmen or foremen.

Among the women Puerto Ricans in New York City, the majority, or about 60%, are employed as operatives in factories. This high proportion compares with only about 14% of all employed women in the U.S. as a whole. Only one-fifth of the Puerto Rican women in the U.S. are white-collar workers, while 54% of all employed women workers in the U.S. are in this kind of work.

But second generation Puerto Ricans in the U.S. show a different occupational distribution. About 57% of the women and nearly a third of the men are white-collar workers.

Unemployed Puerto Ricans: Since so many Puerto Ricans in the U.S. are in unskilled or semi-skilled occupations, the rate of unemployment among them is especially high. About 10% of the Puerto Rican working population in 1960 were unemployed, as against 5.1% of the labor force as a whole. Among Puerto Rican men aged 25 to 44, the jobless rate was more than double the rate for the same age group in the total work force. For both men and women Puerto Ricans in each age group, the jobless rate was higher than for the overall working force in the U.S.

In the New York City area the unemployment rates for Puerto Rican men and women are more than double the corresponding rates for all New Yorkers and much higher than those for Negroes. The Manpower Report of the President commented: "In a sense even these figures un-

derstate the Puerto Ricans' unemployment problem since many return to their homeland when they are unable to find jobs."

Puerto Rican Incomes: For Puerto Ricans in the U.S. the median annual income was reported in 1959 (latest available) as \$2,533, or about \$300 lower than the median for the total U.S. population. For Puerto Rican men in the U.S. median income was only \$2,935, compared with \$4,111 for all men.

One-third of the Puerto Rican families in the U.S. had incomes of less than \$3,000, compared with about one-fifth of all American families in this income category.

In the New York City area in 1959 the median income for Puerto Ricans was only \$2,515—about 30% below the median of \$3,560 for the New York population as a whole. Among Puerto Rican men the median income was \$2,907, or about 40% below that of New York men in general.

Half of the Puerto Rican families in New York in 1959 had to live on less than \$3,839 a year while for all New Yorkers the median income was \$6,548. Even compared with nonwhite (mostly Negro) New York families the Puerto Ricans were disadvantaged. Their median family income in 1959 was \$645 below that of the city's nonwhites.

Reporting on the "poverty trap" into which the Puerto Ricans have fallen in New York City, *Herald Tribune* reporters (Feb. 1, 1965) noted that 22% of Puerto Ricans are now receiving welfare compared with about 17% of all Negroes. They conclude that: "In a city in which the problems of the Negro and the aged are extreme, the problems of the Puerto Ricans are even more critical. If job opportunities are limited for Negroes, they are worse for Puerto Ricans." The same is true for housing. "And if prejudice against Negroes is bad, it is worse, much much worse, against Puerto Ricans."

Proposals: The high rate of youth unemployment among Puerto Ricans demands major efforts in training and placement. There must be more also on "removing any discriminatory bars that limit their employment opportunities and their general adjustment," as the Manpower Report makes clear.

In a special series of articles on Puerto Ricans in New York City, the *National Guardian* (April 4, 11 and 25, 1964) reported that a Committee for Police Community Relations had been set up in East Harlem, New York City. The committee will seek to impress upon police the need for special training for police working in neighborhoods where the population has a different cultural background. The series concludes: "The wars on rats, on slum landlords, on poverty continue; the rent strikes go on, and the marches on the Board of Education, City Hall and the State Legislature continue. And the ranks of those who refuse to accept misery and poverty grow."

Neighborhood groups are beginning to deal with such problems as intolerable housing, discrimination in schools and drug addiction. City-wide groups are starting a large-scale assault on the problems of Puerto Ricans. An important new group in New York City is the National Association for Puerto Rican Civil Rights which took part in New York's first school boycott in March 1964 and a silent march for better schools. They demonstrated against discrimination, for more jobs and for real city planning.

However, the failure of the city to do anything effective for Puerto Rican poverty was illustrated by the closing of what the *New York Times* (March 4, 1965) called "a highly heralded Puerto Rican self-help effort," the Puerto Rican Community Development Project. It was under the direction of the Puerto Rican Forum, but the city administration Anti-poverty Operations Board failed to provide the promised funds for various neighborhood programs it had submitted. The Forum pointed out that Puerto Ricans suffer disproportionately from poverty, and "face the prospect of being permanently relegated to an indigent poor status." A spokesman for the city promised that new anti-poverty projects would be developed which would include Puerto Rican programs.

AMERICAN INDIANS

Ever since the white colonists first settled in North America in the early 1600's, the American Indians have been kept at a disadvantage in the country that was once theirs. They have been pushed back farther and farther westward until today they are concentrated in a few states of the West and Southwest. White men's actions toward the Indians have been called "a great genocidal crusade."

Today there are about 570,000 Indians in the U.S., about two-thirds of them living on reservations where they are racially segregated from other Americans. Stan Steiner, who visited various Indian reservations in 1964 reported that the Indians' poverty and misery are the result of U.S. government policy, since nearly half of the able-bodied population cannot find work. On some reservations the proportion of jobless is as high as 75%. Unemployment among the Indians in 1964 was estimated as 10 times the national average. Steiner stated "Indian poverty is so widespread and so intense that it tends to fall outside national calculations." (*The Nation*, June 22, 1964.)

High Jobless Rate: At the Acoma reservation in New Mexico, reports of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs showed that out of 1,380 persons between 18 and 55 years old only 197 had jobs. Of 13,711 adults at 18 pueblos in that state only 3,212 were employed and half of these had only temporary jobs. Of every 100 persons 77 were jobless. In another area of New Mexico the unemployment rate among Indians was 71.7%.

In Montana, on the Blackfeet reservation, recent reports revealed a "permanent unemployment rate" of 72.5%. Of 2,000 Indians there, 1,500 were jobless. The yearly income was less than \$500 per family.

In southern Mississippi on the Choctaw reservation, out of 1,225 adults only 170 had jobs. Similar conditions existed on other reservations. Mainly as a result of unemployment, the average annual income of working Indians of the Sioux tribe in North and South Dakota is only \$105 or about 30¢ a day.

At the annual discussion of "The Indian Problem" at the White House in 1964, Indian tribal leaders presented an appeal to President Johnson from the National Congress of Indians. It stated in part: "Unemployment is our major concern. Almost one-half of the employable American Indians are without jobs. On some reservations three-fourths are unemployed. Reservations are indeed pockets of poverty."

Substandard Housing and Health: It has been estimated that 90% of Indian families live in substandard housing. Of every 10 Indian families 9 still live in tin-roofed shacks or adobe huts far below minimum housing standards. This fact was officially reported in August 1964 by the U.S. Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Philleo Nash. Average schooling of young Indians is only 8 years, far below the national average of 12 years.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs maintains a \$25-million fund for economic development on and around Indian reservations, but applications for assistance total many times that amount.

"The burden of disease is heavy," the Public Health Service reports. "Much of it is associated with the hazards and rigors of the environment in which these Indian beneficiaries live." The average "death age" of an Indian is 42 years, compared to an average of 62 for the general population. The death rate of Indian babies is 3 times higher than the national average. Infant mortality accounts for 21% of all Indian deaths compared to 6% for the general population. Nutritional deficiencies are associated with many of the illnesses and diseases. Malnutrition of babies results in long periods of hospitalization and premature, unnecessary death.

As Steiner points out, the U.S. clearly has an obligation "to lift the bondage of perpetual poverty from these proud, intensely patriotic and undefeatable people."

In its Manpower Report to the President (March 1964) the U.S. Department of Labor said: "The most disadvantaged group within the country is its indigenous population, the American Indians." It calls for a total program to raise their health and educational levels, and concludes: "While Indian welfare shows improvement, progress is delayed by the limited resources available and the great gap between the material culture of the Indians and that of the modern industrial world."

III. PEACE ISSUES AND ACTIVITIES

ATOMIC ARMS RACE

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara on Feb. 18, 1965, in his annual "military posture" statement to the House Armed Services Committee, estimated that 122 million Americans would die in case of a missile attack on the U.S. by the Soviet Union. This would be the toll in case the attack were in 1970 and limited to military targets, or what McNamara called a "delayed urban attack." If it included urban centers, the death toll would be 149 million out of a population in 1970 of 210 million.

McNamara was arguing for a fall-out shelter and other "damage-limiting" programs such as anti-missile systems. But he admitted that a program costing up to \$25 billion would only reduce the initial death toll to around 80 million, with the lingering effects of deadly radiation still unaccounted for. Even the 149 million figure does not include the long-term radiation effects.

"From what was learned at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, millions more would suffer various diseases caused by radiation poison, shortening their lives and making survival an agonizing experience," comments the Wells Newsletter, *Between the Lines* (March 15, 1965). "The problems of sanitation, controlling pestilences, epidemics and other details related to the disposal of over 100 million dead, have all been studied and shelved in Civil Defense files. Likewise there's the matter of caring for millions who will be slowly dying from the multiple burns, lacerations and other types of injuries from the nuclear blasts—with most of our nuclear facilities destroyed. All these aspects have been examined and set aside as beyond human capacity to grasp or anticipate. It is openly conceded that Civil Defense can scarcely deal with the fringes of the problem."

No Technical Solution: A similar statement on the total destructiveness of present-day nuclear weapons was made by Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, former special assistant for science and technology to the late President Kennedy and Dean of the School of Science at M.I.T., and Dr. Herbert F. York, Chancellor of the University of California at San

Diego and chief scientist of the Advanced Research Projects Agency in the Pentagon during the Eisenhower Administration.

In an article in the Oct. 1964 *Scientific American* they warned not only of the total destructiveness of nuclear weapons but explained that no adequate defense could ever be built against such an attack. Dr. George Kistiakowsky, another scientist-engineer, who was science adviser to President Eisenhower, has stated his agreement with the Wiesner-York observations.

They prove that both sides in the arms race are "confronted by the dilemma of steadily increasing military power and steadily decreasing national security." And they put this sentence in italics: "*It is our considered professional judgment that this dilemma has no technical solution.*"

Their conclusion: "If the great powers continue to look for solutions in the area of science and technology only, the result will be to worsen the situation. The clearly predictable course of the arms race is a steady open spiral downward into oblivion." The two scientists urge a comprehensive nuclear test ban extended to underground testing.

(Similar authoritative estimates of the mutually suicidal nature of nuclear war were given in *Labor Fact Book 16*, pp. 57-59.)

Megadevastation: Commenting on this brink-of-complete holocaust situation, Walter Millis, one of America's foremost students of the political meaning of war, says in his latest book, *An End to Arms*:

"It is believed that the world's military arsenals today contain nuclear explosives equivalent to about 70 tons of TNT for every living human being; these explosives, moreover, are usable *only* for the destruction of human life and its ecology. It is unnecessary to repeat the many available estimates of the 'megadeaths' (millions of deaths) and the environmental megadevastations which the actual employment of these weapons would probably produce. More shocking than the statistics—too huge in themselves to be comprehensible—is the simple fact that in the United States, the Soviet Union and other advanced states a large number of the best and most highly trained brains that the community can produce are almost wholly devoted to the design and production of amazingly sophisticated and costly instruments which can be put to no actual use except the mass torture and destruction of man and the probable extinction of his culture. It is a fact so inhuman, so patently immoral and so pointless as to stagger the intelligence."

CONCENTRATION OF MILITARY CONTRACTS

Military contracts given by the U.S. Defense Department have been concentrated in a few large companies specializing in this sort of work. For the fiscal year 1964, the government reported, 100 leading companies

and their 180 subsidiaries accounted for 73% of total net value of military prime contract awards. And the contracts given to the top 25 companies equalled 53% of the procurement total.

For the third consecutive year Lockheed Aircraft Corp. led the list with \$1,455 million of contracts, or nearly 6% of the total.

Next in line was the Boeing Co. with \$1,365 million of contracts, followed by McDonnell Aircraft Corp., with \$1,157 million; North American Aviation, with \$1 billion, and General Dynamics Corp. with \$987 million.

Concentration is even greater in the research and development work for the Defense Department where "there are fewer opportunities for individual companies within the market," as the Security First National Bank of Los Angeles reported. (*Monthly Summary*, March 1, 1965.) It says, "It is estimated that over half of the dollars for Department of Defense research and development projects go to fewer than 10 firms. For comparable NASA (Nat'l Aeronautics and Space Administration) contracts, only 5 firms obtain a similar share."

TEST BAN TREATY

A treaty to outlaw nuclear testing in the atmosphere, in space and under water was signed in Moscow, Aug. 5, 1963, by representatives of the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union. It was later ratified by the U.S. Senate (Sept. 24) by an 80-19 vote, and signed by more than 100 other nations.

Article I declared, "Each of the parties to this treaty undertakes to prohibit, to prevent, and not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion at any place under its jurisdiction or control: (a) In the atmosphere, beyond its limits, including outer space, or underwater, including territorial waters or high seas; or (b) In any other environment if such explosion causes radioactive debris to be present outside the territorial limits of the state under whose jurisdiction or control such explosion is conducted. . . ."

Underground tests are still permitted so long as they do not spread radio active debris beyond the territory where they are conducted.

The treaty provides that it should be open to all states for signature and also that each party shall have the right to withdraw, with 3 months' notice, if it decides that extraordinary events "have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country."

This was the first major accord between East and West since the conclusion of the Austrian State Treaty on May 15, 1955, which ended the postwar occupation of that country. And it was the first agreement between the 3 major powers on an issue relating to the cold war.

Dr. Linus Pauling, who had been leading the fight of world scientists

and others against nuclear testing, said the treaty "may well be described as the most important international agreement ever made. It will in large part stop further contamination of the atmosphere with radioactive fission products and carbon 14 which, produced by the previous bomb tests, has been doing damage to the pool of human germ plasm such as to cause a significant increase in the number of grossly defective children born."

It was expected that the treaty would act as a deterrent to the spread of nuclear weapons to additional countries, thereby lessening the danger of nuclear war; that it would have the practical effect of slowing down the arms race, and be a first step toward reducing world tensions and thus lead to broader areas of agreement on the control of nuclear weapons.

Supporting the Administration and those who voted for the treaty in the Senate, *Advance* (Aug. 1, 1963), official organ of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers (AFL-CIO), said: "This could be the greatest boon that our world will know for years. . . . One of the prime advantages of a nuclear test ban would be a declaration of intent—that the time for nuclear bomb rattling has passed and the time for mature and serious exploration of the road to peace has arrived. In an atmosphere free from 'jingoism' perhaps the foundation for a lasting peace can be laid down."

PEACE CONVOCATION

A broad discussion of peace and coexistence was held in New York City Feb. 17-20, 1965, at the International Convocation on the Requirements for Peace, arranged by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. It was considered one of the most significant peace assemblies under private auspices in the U.S. since World War II. Its point of departure was the famous encyclical of Pope John XXIII, *Pacem in Terris*.

Its opening ceremony in the General Assembly Hall of the UN was addressed by, among others, the Secretary General of the UN and the President of the General Assembly.

Robert M. Hutchins, president of the Center, explained that the purpose was to find how we can make peace, "not peace through the medium of war, not peace through the dreadful mechanism of terror, but peace, pure, simple and durable."

The speakers ranged from Henry R. Luce of *Time* magazine to N. N. Inozemtsev of *Pravda*; from Vice President Hubert Humphrey to Dagmar Wilson of Women Strike for Peace. "There were some notable gaps in the array of speakers," Arnold Johnson reported in an article on the Convocation in *Political Affairs*, May 1965. "The participa-

tion of representative labor leaders on the platform was not achieved, and that of leading Negro Americans was very limited." Some 20 countries were represented among the speakers but there were none from Cuba, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the People's Republic of China or the German Democratic Republic.

Coexistence and Vietnam: Dr. Adam Schaff of the Central Committee of the United Workers' (Communist) Party of Poland said that coexistence "requires tolerance, coming closer together, knowing each other better." It means "competition for the hearts and brains of people," as well as a renunciation of "hot war."

Although no resolutions were adopted on any subject, more than 400 of the 2,500 participants addressed a petition of support to UN Secretary-General U Thant for his call for real negotiations in Vietnam and a larger number sent a petition of protest to President Johnson. Yevgeniy Zhukov, Director of the Institute of History, Academy of Sciences, USSR, said: "I consider it my duty to let this high assembly know that the Soviet public condemns U.S. intervention in Vietnam, as an actual retreat from the peaceful statements made recently by the U.S."

The wide range of topics discussed included nationalism and sovereignty, international law, poverty, race and freedom, economic assistance, UN Charter revision, world government, war and man, nuclear proliferation, the German problem and international cooperation. (Full proceedings of the Convocation are published by Pocket Books in a paperback edition.)

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM

This oldest international women's peace organization celebrated its 50th Anniversary in 1965. It was founded at a Congress of women from belligerent and neutral countries in The Hague during World War I. The major emphases of the program of the U.S. Section in the international field since the ratification of the Test Ban Treaty have been on stopping the war in Vietnam through negotiation of a cease-fire and negotiation of a political settlement through reconvening of the Geneva Powers Conference; admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations and recognition of that government by the U.S.; Senate ratification of the Human Rights Conventions on genocide, slavery, forced labor and women's rights pending before it.

In the domestic field the League worked hard for the passage of the Civil Rights Act and is now pushing for its enforcement throughout the country. It continues to urge the abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee, which has been its position since 1950.

The League is stressing particularly the interrelation of peace and

freedom, which it has always understood, and has made The Triple Challenge, Peace, Freedom and Jobs, the theme of the 50th Anniversary Year.

The League has also promoted international exchanges of views among women of different ideological backgrounds. The 1961 Soviet-American Women's Conference on Disarmament and Peace which it sponsored at Bryn Mawr College was followed by a return session in Moscow in 1964. In 1963 a delegation from the League visited Poland as guests of the League of Polish Women and in 1965 a group from Poland were to be guests of the U.S. Section.

WOMEN STRIKE FOR PEACE

The second year of activity of this organization began in November 1962 with the same general goals but with emphasis on lobbying efforts, especially for the signing of a nuclear test ban treaty.

One of its most effective demonstrations was on May 7, 1963, when 2,000 filled the railroad station in Washington, D.C. Representing women from 37 states they marched to the Congressional buildings, visiting the offices of 79 Senators and many Representatives in support of the proposed test ban treaty.

In the following months they participated in demonstrations against the visit to Washington of Madame Nhu of South Vietnam. They conducted lobbies against the proposed fall-out shelter bill, and for a full test ban treaty covering also underground tests.

Another lobby was carried on in March 1964 with 500 women coming to Washington to press for a full test ban treaty and in opposition to the shelter bill. They also expressed support for Senator McGovern's bill for conversion of military facilities to a civilian economy and in opposition to the newly proposed multilateral nuclear fleet, called MLF.

Against MLF: As described by the WSP, "MLF was a State Department plan to arm 25 NATO ships each with 8 Polaris missiles manned by a majority of American and West German forces. The State Department rationale for the scheme was that it would satisfy West German desires for nuclear parity by giving them some nuclear control. WSP objected to MLF as just another way to spread nuclear weapons, thereby interfering with United States efforts for a non-proliferation treaty, and because MLF discussion had brought disarmament talks in Geneva to a standstill."

Even though State Department officials told the WSP people to let MLF alone and to stick to simple disarmament, the WSP planned for a 3-day conference in The Hague at the time of the annual NATO conference there, May 12-14, 1964. The Dutch government refused to permit some of the women from U.S., Canada and Britain to enter the

country but then reversed its decision and 1,300 women, including 700 West German women, opened their protest against MLF with a silent walk near the building where NATO officials were meeting. The women obtained interviews with officials at several NATO embassies and presented their appeals "for attaining international security through negotiated solutions."

Protests Here and Abroad: Later in Dec. 1964 WSP joined peace workers from 60 international groups in Paris demonstrating at a meeting of NATO foreign ministers. Two WSPers were held overnight in jail as a result of the demonstration. Meanwhile in New York 6,000 signatures from people in 28 states were taken to the U.S. mission of the UN urging disarmament, opposing MLF and urging admission of People's China to the UN.

In Dec. 1964 two WSP founders, Dagmar Wilson and Donna Allen, were harassed by the House Un-American Activities Committee. (See page 100.)

In Jan. 1965 WSP was heading a drive to get public hearings on Vietnam policy by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It organized a big lobby-by-proxy drive on this issue before Congress and participated in a Mother's Lobby of 350. They marched to the White House representing some 25,000 from 35 states and called also on Senators and Representatives. WSP organized a demonstration of some 2,500 before the UN on Feb. 13 and joined with others in protest marches against the Vietnam war over the weekend of Feb. 22.

Two excellent publications issued by WSP in this period were *The Story of Disarmament, 1945-1963*; and *The German Problem: Road-block to Disarmament*, which was published as part of the anti-MLF effort of WSP.

SANE

National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy (SANE) at its Seventh Annual Conference, Nov. 13-15, 1964, approved merger with United World Federalists. (See *Labor Fact Book* 16, p. 73.) This was still to be approved by the UWF and the National SANE board.

The 1965 "program priorities" of SANE included efforts to stop the spread of nuclear weapons: "Oppose MLF and support mutual security arrangements through disarmament and political settlements in Europe. Make the test-ban treaty comprehensive. Bring China into the disarmament negotiations and the U.N. Settle the war in Vietnam and work for the goal of a non-aligned Asia."

To "ready the U.S. for peace" it would "Plan for the conversion of the U.S. economy. Reduce the current U.S. military budget through American initiative, opposing new military systems (e.g., anti-ballistic

missile and major civil defense systems), and accepting pending partial disarmament measures."

On Vietnam War: In a new statement on the Vietnam war the SANE conference said that the military efforts of the U.S. in South Vietnam "have tended to make Americans appear as colonialists in Vietnamese eyes." It opposed present policy of attempting to win a "war which cannot be won." In addition to urging negotiations "for an immediate cease-fire in South Vietnam," it calls on the U.S. "to support the convening of a conference of all the powers present (including China and the two Vietnamese states) at the Geneva Conferences of 1954 and 1962. Such a conference should seek a framework for big-power guarantees of Vietnamese neutrality; increased contacts between North and South Vietnam; and the possibility of reunification, of internationally-supervised free elections, and the use of U.N. peacekeeping machinery."

Following a political settlement "the U.S. should be prepared to join all other foreign powers in withdrawing their military forces and equipment from the area encompassed in the agreement."

On MLF: The multilateral nuclear force, proposed by the U.S. and accepted with enthusiasm in West Germany, says SANE, represented a major threat to a detente with the Soviet Union. If West Germany joined in such a force it "would have to violate the treaties of 1954 and 1963 which prohibit her from manufacturing and testing nuclear weapons." Also, the MLF, by spreading control over nuclear weapons to additional nations, "creates the very danger which it claims to avoid."

It stated further that, "A new framework for all-European security can be achieved by combining political settlements in Central Europe with mutual arms reductions. The new relationships thus achieved could be institutionalized through a security agreement between the NATO and Warsaw Pact powers, guaranteed by the U.S. and U.S.S.R." (All quotes from *SANE World*, Jan. 1965.)

QUAKER POSITION

A statement on Vietnam and World Peace, approved at the Annual Meeting of the Friends Committee on National Legislation March 19-21, 1965, opposed "the drift toward general war in Southeast Asia. We deplore the increasing U.S. military involvement and failure to respond to appeals by Pope Paul, UN Secretary-General U Thant, and many other of the world leaders who have called for negotiation. . . . We do not believe that military bombardment of North Vietnam enhances the likelihood for a satisfactory settlement at the conference table. Nor does it set the kind of example we wish other nations to follow."

The statement called for "an end to bombing of North Vietnam; a

cease fire by U.S. and South Vietnamese forces for a period of 4 weeks, for example, to encourage a beginning of international negotiations."

It urged also "a phased withdrawal of U.S. and other outside military forces from Southeast Asia looking toward a non-aligned status for the nations in that area . . . immediate efforts by our Government to remove restrictions and open communications, trade and travel with the People's Republic of China and North Vietnam. Since Chinese cooperation is essential to the achievement of permanent peace in the Pacific, these efforts would be directed toward securing their greater participation in disarmament measures and in the community of nations. A beginning step might be cessation of overflights over Mainland China."

It also called for, "Negotiations with Communist nations on issues such as: China's rightful role in Asia, progressive settlements in Europe and reunification of divided nations, assurance of the opportunity for peaceful change in developing nations without outside military intervention. . . ."

American Friends Service Committee: Since the end of World War II the American Friends Service Committee, founded in 1917 as a foreign relief and voluntary service organization of the Society of Friends (Quakers), has "turned increasingly toward the prevention of further conflict through the promotion of international understanding." It describes itself as "a Quaker organization dedicated to helping create conditions under which true peace can exist."

Its Peace Education Division carries on extensive activity working through the 11 branches of the AFSC in the U.S. Especially effective work has been done by its New England Peace Education Committee which issued a 12-page newspaper (April 15, 1965), the *U.S.-Vietnam Crisis*, quoting outstanding statements on the situation.

CONSCIENCE ON VIETNAM

A declaration of "conscientious refusal to cooperate with the United States government in the prosecution of war in Vietnam" was circulated in early 1965 by a group of prominent peace leaders, churchmen, writers and others. It included several Catholic clergymen; also A. Philip Randolph, W. H. Ferry, Paul Goodman, Otto Nathan, Eric Fromm, Harvey Swados, Milton Mayer, A. J. Muste, Bayard Rustin and leaders in the Committee for Nonviolent Action.

The declaration was issued: "Because the use of the military resources of the U.S. in Vietnam and elsewhere suppresses the aspirations of the people for political independence and economic freedom; because inhuman torture and senseless killing are being carried out by forces armed, uniformed, trained and financed by the U.S.; because we believe that all peoples of the earth, including both Americans and non-Ameri-

cans, have an inalienable right to life, liberty, and the peaceful pursuit of happiness in their own way; and because we think that positive steps must be taken to put an end to the threat of nuclear catastrophe and death by chemical or biological warfare, whether these result from accident or escalation."

It expressed encouragement for those who can conscientiously do so "to refuse to serve in the armed forces and to ask for discharge if they are already in." And "those of us who are subject to the draft ourselves declare our intention to refuse to serve." Also, "We urge others to refuse and refuse ourselves to take part in the manufacture or transportation of military equipment, or to work in the fields of military research and weapons development."

It also sought to encourage the development of other nonviolent acts, including acts which involve civil disobedience, in order to stop the flow of American soldiers and munitions to Vietnam.

Military Parade Sit-Down: A typical act of this character was the direct confrontation of the Armed Forces Day Parade in New York City May 15, 1965, when a group of some 30 were arrested for a sit-down in front of marching military units. This action was sponsored by the New York Workshop in Nonviolence in cooperation with Students for a Democratic Society, War Resisters League, Catholic Worker, Committee for Nonviolent Action, Student Peace Union and Greenwich Village Peace Center.

Another Declaration of Conscience was circulated nationally by the May 2nd Movement, an intercollege student organization. Signed by hundreds of young people, it stated, "We, the undersigned are young Americans of draft age. We are opposed to U.S. intervention in the war in South Vietnam. U.S. participation in that war for the suppression of the Vietnamese struggle for self-determination and national independence. We herewith state our refusal to fight against the people of South Vietnam."

CONGRESSIONAL CONSCIENCE ON VIETNAM

A number of U.S. Senators led by Wayne B. Morse of Oregon and Ernest Gruening of Alaska expressed their opposition to Administration policy in Vietnam. During 1964-65 they gave many well-documented speeches in the Senate and inserted in the *Congressional Record* editorials, articles and letters supporting their position. Other Democratic Senators questioning Pentagon policy on Vietnam were Church of Idaho and McGovern of South Dakota.

In an introduction to a booklet quoting statements by these and others called *The Conscience of the Senate on the Vietnam War*, Carl Marzani in April 1965 noted that 9 other Democrats had expressed support in one

way or another, though sometimes very quietly: Senators Pell of Rhode Island, Ellender of Louisiana, Johnson of South Carolina (who died in April 1965), Bartlett of Alaska, Young of Ohio, McCarthy of Minnesota, Nelson of Wisconsin, Fulbright of Arkansas and Mansfield of Montana. In addition, 3 Republicans, Javits of New York, Saltonstall of Massachusetts and Aiken of Vermont "have given some token aid. In all, 16 Senators favor negotiations publicly; many more do so privately."

The first page of the pamphlet gives an early excerpt from the *Congressional Record*, April 16, 1954, in which the then Senator John F. Kennedy, in answer to the optimistic reports of the War and State Department heads about the prospects of French victory over the Viet Minh said, "I am frankly of the belief that no amount of American military assistance in Indochina can conquer an enemy which is everywhere and at the same time nowhere . . . which has the sympathy and covert support of the people."

He stated further that, "For the United States to intervene unilaterally and to send troops into the most difficult terrain in the world . . . would mean that we would face a situation which would be far more difficult than even that we encountered in Korea. It seems to me it would be a hopeless situation."

In the brief congressional debate May 5-6, 1965, on the Administration's request for \$700 million extra funds for expanding the Vietnam war, about 33 Senators and Representatives indicated some form of opposition to the President's policy, but only 10 actually voted "No"—3 Senators, Morse, Gruening and Nelson, and 7 Representatives: Brown (Calif.), Burton (Calif.), Conyers (Mich.), Dow (N.Y.), Edwards (Calif.), Green (Ore.), and Ryan (N.Y.).

CHEMICAL WARFARE CONDEMNED

Concerning the use of gas by the U.S. military forces in Vietnam the Federation of American Scientists on March 25, 1965, said it is "morally repugnant" that the United States should find itself a party to the use of weapons of indiscriminate effect, with principal effectiveness against civilian populations. "The characterization of such applications (against civilian populations) as 'humane' is incomprehensible, to say the least. In recent weeks, we have been treated to a succession of stories which have included the employment of napalm against villages, the use of crop-destroying agents, so-called defoliating chemicals, and now the use of gas against civilians. . . . The use of United States-produced chemical and biological weapons in Asia will be interpreted widely as 'field-testing' . . . among foreign people and will hurt our efforts immeasurably in good will and moral respect."

Prof. Peter G. Bergman of Syracuse University and 3 other distin-

guished science professors from Harvard, Dartmouth and MIT, in a letter to the *N.Y. Times* (Dec. 31, 1964), in discussing the new chemical warfare agents being developed by the U.S. Army, said: "What little information is publicly available about the army's highly secret research program suggests that much effort is being expended to develop chemical and biological agents even more lethal than those presently deployed."

The Federation of American Scientists, they said, "has pointed out that the development and introduction of these very dangerous, easily manufactured, and very cheap weapons on a worldwide scale would seriously weaken the effect of our nuclear deterrent, and might sufficiently disturb the balance of forces to touch off a major war." The Physicians for Social Responsibility took a similar position, protesting the further development and production of these weapons.

Six Republicans Protest: Even some Republican Congressmen deplored the use of gas warfare in Vietnam. Rep. John V. Lindsay (R., N.Y.) and 5 other Republican Congressmen in a letter to President Johnson, March 23, 1965, cited 8 reasons why the use of gas, even though of non-lethal variety is "directly counter to the purpose of U.S. policy in Vietnam and Southeast Asia." Even though accepting the myth of North Vietnam aggression, the Republicans stated that by using gas warfare "the U.S. may have united all the peoples of Asia against us as cruel and inhumane oppressors." They told Johnson, "We urge you to call an immediate halt to the use of gas in Vietnam."

WASHINGTON MARCH AGAINST WAR

A new flood of peace activity began when the U.S. started bombing North Vietnam early in Feb. 1965. Demonstrations against continued escalation of the war were held on hundreds of campuses and in scores of cities. Teach-ins, petitions, statements multiplied.

The Students for a Democratic Society, the campus peace and human rights organization, decided on a mighty protest calling on all other peace groups to join. The result was the largest peace demonstration in U.S. history on April 17, 1965, Easter Saturday, called by its sponsors a "March on Washington to End the War in Vietnam." It rallied over 20,000 persons, mostly students from all over the U.S., under the simple statement that the "war in Vietnam injures both Vietnamese and Americans, and should be stopped."

They picketed in front of the White House, and later after a meeting at the open-air Sylvan Theatre, marched to the Capitol Building to deliver a petition to Congress which made a number of suggestions for ending the war, including "reconvening of the Geneva Conference, negotiations with the National Liberation Front and North Vietnam, immediate withdrawal, and UN-supervised elections. Although those

among us might differ as to which of these is most desirable, we are unanimously of the opinion that the war must be brought to a halt."

Among the organizations cooperating in the march were the Student Peace Union, Women Strike for Peace, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Committee for Nonviolent Action, War Resisters League, Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, Young People's Socialist League, DuBois Clubs of America, Youth Against War and Fascism, the May 2nd Movement, and several labor union locals. It was estimated that nearly 10% of the marchers were Negroes, most of them active in the civil rights movement.

The commercial press, radio and television played down the march and gave disproportionate attention to a tiny group of Fascist and Right-wing pickets that were almost unnoticed by the throngs of anti-war demonstrators. The tremendous success of the demonstration led to violent McCarthyite cries from some of the press with the usual charges of the "insidious hand of Communist subversion." (*N.Y. Journal American*, April 22.)

STUDENT-FACULTY ACTION FOR PEACE

The organization that led the Washington peace demonstration, Students for a Democratic Society, was founded in 1962 as the student department of the League for Industrial Democracy. It had grown by 1965 into a society of about 2,000 "young people on the left," organized in some 50 chapters, seeking to bring together "liberals and radicals, activists and scholars, students and faculty." In the school year 1964-65 it reported it had maintained 7 community organizing projects with a full-time staff of over 50.

It has been actively involved in the struggle for peace, civil rights and civil liberties through direct action and in cooperation with the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the Northern Student Movement, the Southern Student Organizing Committee, the Student Peace Union and the Committee for Nonviolent Action. In 1964-65 it participated in and organized national support for the Berkeley Free Speech Movement.

The W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America, a socialist youth organization, started in California in 1962, became a national organization in 1964. Its clubs, numbering more than 30, were especially active in the struggle for peace in this period.

The organization's constitution states that "this nation can best solve its problems in an atmosphere of peaceful coexistence, complete disarmament and true freedom for all peoples of the world, and that these solutions will be reached mainly through the united efforts of all democratic elements in our country. . . ."

Among other youth and student peace groups with more than a local

influence were the Student Peace Union, the May 2nd Movement, and Youth Against War and Fascism. They held demonstrations on campuses and elsewhere protesting the draft, and U.S. intervention in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

Campus Teach-Ins: Most student activity in the first half of 1965, however, was carried on by local *ad hoc* committees many of which, in cooperation with faculty members, conducted various types of teach-ins, a sort of marathon lecturing session often running through the night. Originated at the University of Michigan in March, it was estimated that at least 100 of them had been held within 2 months, with student audiences ranging up to 10,000, the number involved in the University of California (Berkeley) 36-hour meeting in May. It was addressed not only by local professors and those from other colleges but also by U.S. Senator Ernest Gruening, progressive labor leader Louis Goldblatt of the Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, and Dr. Benjamin Spock.

Another typical 12-hour series of seminars and meetings at the University of Oregon in April was attended by 3,000, addressed by Senator Wayne Morse and others. Its resolutions condemned the U.S. government for its "unilateral intervention" in Vietnam and for "wilfully misrepresenting the facts concerning the war."

Special radio hook-ups were arranged for the largest teach-in of all on May 15 when 5,000 assembled in Washington to hear a debate on Vietnam policy which reached about 150,000 others on more than 100 campuses in 35 states, in addition to millions in the broader radio and television audience. The majority of the academic listeners were strongly in favor of the anti-Administration position.

OTHER FORCES FOR PEACE

Other organizations, some of them described in *Labor Fact Book 16*, continue active in the struggle for peace. For example:

An effective local organization, PAX (Massachusetts Political Action for Peace) developed out of the efforts of Prof. H. Stuart Hughes of Harvard when he ran for the U.S. Senate on an independent peace ticket in 1962. In 1965 PAX put a complete rebuttal of the State Department's White Paper on Vietnam as a paid ad in the *N.Y. Times*.

Council for a Livable World: A national organization founded in 1962 by the late Leo Szilard, the famed nuclear physicist, is the Council for a Livable World. In the 1964 election it continued its policy of raising and contributing money for the support of Senate and House candidates whom it considered enlightened and who "are willing to exert continuing and effective pressure for the achievement of responsible measures of arms control and disarmament." It reported that 14 of

the 18 candidates it supported had been victorious. The Council, made up mostly of scientists and interested laymen, also issues study papers and organizes seminars on vital questions of the nuclear age. Its basic belief is expressed in its action program which says that the U.S. "can no longer rely for its security on its arsenal of nuclear weapons or on its ability to act independently . . . great military strength can no longer insure the defense of a nation."

Clergymen and Other Professionals: Religious groups were especially active in the stepped-up peace activity following the escalation of war in Vietnam. The Fellowship of Reconciliation collected some 2,700 signatures from clergymen all over the country and put a paid appeal in the *N.Y. Times* April 4, 1965: "Mr. President. In the name of God, STOP IT." A later one, April 18, signed by nearly 17,000 clergymen called for a cease fire and initiating negotiations.

In a direct appeal to the Defense Department, the Interreligious Committee on Vietnam held a silent vigil at the Pentagon May 12 with more than 800 ministers and laymen in line and obtained an interview with Secretary McNamara. The General Board of the National Council of Churches in February had urged the government to negotiate a cease fire and a settlement of the war.

Promoting Enduring Peace, an organization with offices in Woodmont, Conn., has continued to issue millions of leaflets on peace, distributed mainly to religious and educational organizations. A book on *Disarmament—A World View*, by Jerome Davis, executive director of PEP, was published in 1964 by Citadel Press, with chapters by world peace leaders. Every year PEP makes a Gandhi Peace Award which has gone to such people as Eleanor Roosevelt, Dr. Linus Pauling, Dr. Edwin Dahlberg and James Warburg.

International Goodwill Seminars are organized by PEP to meet leaders and people in countries in both east and west Europe. In 1964, for example, the seminar members went into some 100 homes in the Soviet Union for direct talks with the people.

In addition to increased activity by existing peace organizations, the Vietnam war evoked a series of protest appeals not only from teachers and clergymen but also from *ad hoc* committees of doctors, social workers, artists and scientists, all calling for an end to the killing. One open letter appeal to the President came from the Industrial and Research Scientists Committee on Vietnam, composed at the outset largely of staff people at Bell Telephone Laboratories and International Business Machines Corp. It held that "we are waging an immoral and inhumane war" on the majority of the people of Vietnam.

IV. NEGROES AND CIVIL RIGHTS

NEGRO INCOMES

In a special study of *The Economic Status of Negroes: In the Nation and in the South*, Prof. V. W. Henderson of Fisk University reports that "60% of the Negro families in this country today still have incomes of less than \$4,000 annually, compared with 28% of the white families." (His figures are based on the U.S. Department of Commerce, *Consumer Income*, Series P-60, Aug. 28, 1962.)

The median wage or salary income of white families (and unrelated individuals) in 1961 was \$5,570 but for nonwhites (mostly Negroes) it was only \$2,908. In other words, the nonwhite median income was only 52.2% of the white income. The study concludes: "The percent of Negro families in lower income brackets is twice as high as whites, and the differential in earnings of whites and Negroes continues to widen."

In the U.S. as a whole, the number of Negroes in better-paying semi-skilled and white-collar jobs doubled between 1940 and 1961. But in the South the gain in the Negroes' economic situation has been slight. The difference in their economic progress, this special study concludes, reflects not only the southern lag in general but also a substantial lag in employment and occupational opportunity for Negroes in the South as compared with opportunity in other regions.

About 50% of the nation's Negroes are concentrated in the South and the South receives only about 20% of the nation's total income. What is needed, this study concludes, to improve the Negroes' economic situation in the U.S. is a "vigorous application of public policy in eliminating racial discrimination in education, training and manpower utilization or employment."

In Major Cities: A special study by the National Urban League shows the median income of Negro families in 11 major cities of the U.S. ranged from \$2,977 in New Orleans; \$3,033 in Atlanta, Ga.; \$3,622 in St. Louis; \$4,291 in Philadelphia; \$4,385 in Detroit; \$4,484 in New York; \$4,699 in Gary-Hammond, Ind.; \$4,763 in Washington, D.C.; \$4,768 in Cleveland; \$4,786 in Chicago; to \$5,163 in Los Angeles.

This study defined "middle class" as meaning that a family had an

income of \$6,000 a year or more. In none of these cities did the Negro median family income come up to this amount.

NEGRO WOMEN WORKERS

About 2,445,000 Negro women in the U.S. were working on paid jobs in 1960, an increase of 31% above the 1950 total of 1,870,000. A special study, *Negro Women Workers in 1960* by the U.S. Women's Bureau showed that both in 1950 and 1960 one out of 8 women workers was nonwhite (including a small percentage of American Indian, Oriental and Eskimo, but 93% Negro). Including other nonwhite as well as Negro women the number in the labor force in 1960 totaled nearly 3 million.

Nonwhite women continued their migration away from farms into industrial and metropolitan centers. Many also moved out of the South; the proportion living in southern states dropped from almost three-fourths in 1940 to just over half in 1960.

New Occupations: The major trend in the shift of employment patterns for Negro women has been away from the traditional home service types of work, and reflects recent gains in employment and educational status.

Relatively more Negro women were employed in professional services and public administration in 1960 than in 1950. The percentage gains made by Negro women in these fields were higher than those of white women. For example, the number of Negro women professional workers rose by 67% in the 10 years, while the gain for white women was 40%. Negro women clerical workers increased by 145%; white by 44%. The number of Negro women sales workers went up by 42%; white women in this field by 24%.

There were relatively fewer Negro women employed in personal services, the proportion declining from 52.7% in 1950 to 45.3% in 1960.

Individual occupations which Negro women have recently entered in large numbers include many clerical jobs such as secretary, stenographer, typist, cashier, telephone operator, and bookkeeper. These require more education, skill and responsibility than many jobs held by Negro women before World War II. Among Negro women the percentage of high school graduates rose from 14% to 23% in the 10 years between 1950 and 1960.

The median income of Negro women workers, over 14 years old, was \$1,276 in 1960 compared with \$2,537 for white women workers.

About 1.4 million nonwhite women in 1960 were working wives, constituting almost half of all the nonwhite women workers. One out of 3 nonwhite mothers with small children (under 6 years) was in the labor force. For white mothers the ratio was one out of 5.

Among women 20 years of age and over, a higher proportion of non-white than white women work outside the home. The difference is greatest for women between 25 and 45 years of age.

In a special report issued at the end of 1963, the National Commission on the Status of Women concluded: "In too many families lack of opportunity for men as well as women, linked to racial discrimination, has forced the women to assume too large a share of the family responsibility. Such women are twice as likely as other women to have to seek employment while they have preschool children at home" and most of them are "forced into low-paid occupations."

UNEMPLOYMENT AND JOB DISCRIMINATION

In 1964 white workers, 14 years and over, had a full-time unemployment rate of 4.6%. But nonwhites had a rate more than double this at 9.8%.

The relationship was about the same but the rates were much higher for teenagers between 14 and 19. Here the rate for whites was 13.3% and for nonwhites 26.2%.

The *Manpower Report* of the President for 1965, from which these figures are taken, says the job situation of Negro workers improved a little in 1964, "but remained drastically inferior to that of white workers." Also, "Close to half of all unemployed nonwhites live in families whose combined annual income totals less than \$3,000."

The pattern of job discrimination in the U.S. is still in general the same as that described in the 1963 *Report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights*: "In all sections of the country, the artisans of the skilled trades are overwhelmingly of the white race. Apprenticeship programs . . . contain almost no Negroes," due in part to the "discriminatory practices by unions and employers. . . . Consequently, Negroes are forced to seek the dwindling opportunities for unskilled labor."

In quoting this statement, Nat Hentoff, in his recent book, *The New Equality*, says: "An end to discrimination within unions is not going to result from the voluntary pledges of the unions themselves. . . . With the noted exception of the United Packinghouse Workers of America, exceedingly few international unions have put any degree of convincing pressure on those of their locals which practice bias against Negroes. . . . Technically the AFL-CIO could expel a local which persistently discriminated, but it has never taken such action and its present leadership gives no indication of changing that pattern, particularly with union membership decreasing."

Union Discrimination: Despite pledges and resolutions passed by labor organizations in recent years there are still countless instances of discrimination against nonwhite workers. Although some progress has

been made, the craft unions in the building trades are in general still holding out against the employment of Negroes. Herbert Hill, NAACP labor secretary, estimated in May 1964 that only about one-half of 1% of all mechanics in such skilled trades as plumbers, electricians and operating engineers were Negroes. And even when laborers and less skilled groups were included in the figures the ratio of Negroes was not more than 2%.

Some advances were being made in 1965. In March the plumbers, steamfitters and sheet metal workers unions were admitting their first Negro apprentices in New York, Philadelphia and Cleveland. This was in some cases called mere tokenism by NAACP, CORE and civil rights leaders.

Perhaps the most progress in 1964 had been made when the New York City electricians union in the construction industry reported about 300 Negro and Puerto Rican apprentices. In the case of Local 28 of the Sheet Metal Workers it took action by the New York State Commission for Human Rights to get the first Negro admitted to the apprenticeship program. The Commission on March 24, 1964, directed the union to discard its apprenticeship list and take other measures to end its exclusion of Negroes.

NLRB Decision: An important decision of another government body, the National Labor Relations Board, on July 2, 1964, was also expected to serve as a new tool in the Negro quest for equal opportunity in jobs. For the first time the Board ruled that racial discrimination by a union is an unfair labor practice in violation of the Taft-Hartley (National Labor Relations) Act.

The case grew out of the practice of maintaining two separate locals by the Independent Metal Workers Union, one white and one Negro, at the Hughes Tool Co. plant in Houston, Texas. In 1961 the white local, over protest of the Negro local, signed a revised contract with the company providing for additional apprenticeships to be available only to whites. A member of the Negro local, Ivory Davis, applied for one of the apprenticeships, but was rejected, the company holding that Negroes were ineligible under the contract. The white local also rejected his request. The Negro local then filed with the NLRB an unfair practice charge on his behalf. The Board found that the white local had unlawfully coerced Davis by failing to file his grievance. It held that a certified union may not negotiate a discriminatory contract with an employer and administer it so as to perpetuate discrimination.

Last "White Clause": The Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen was the last of the bona fide labor unions to give up its "white clause" in the union constitution. When it took this step in July 1963 Pres. George Meany of AFL-CIO announced that discrimination in trade unions is now a "bootleg product, sneaked in by the back door and nowhere

condoned." However, there were still many local unions that remained lily-white.

State FEPC Laws: Some 25 states now have mandatory fair employment practice laws. Most of them apply to unions, employment agencies and employers with more than a stipulated number (typically 2 to 12) workers. But enforcement of these state laws is lax and inadequate. Federal legislation, as suggested below, was expected also to be difficult to enforce.

WASHINGTON MARCH

Some 210,000 persons, Negro and white, mostly young, marched in Washington, D.C., on Aug. 28, 1963, in a civil rights demonstration for jobs and freedom, called by the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and 9 other groups. Marchers demanded immediate passage of the pending Civil Rights Act, school desegregation, an end to police brutality, a federal public works program, a stronger Fair Employment Practices Act, and a national minimum wage of \$2 an hour.

The vast crowd, from all parts of the country, filled almost the entire mile-long mall between the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial. The Catholic Archbishop of Washington, Rev. Patrick A. O'Boyle, agreed to appear on the platform if changes were made in the speech of SNCC chairman John Lewis. Student speakers referred to the fact that James Farmer, national director of the Congress of Racial Equality, was in jail in Louisiana at the time for his civil rights activities.

Self-Evident Truths: Rev. Martin Luther King, in his speech to the vast assembly pointed out that 100 years after the Emancipation Proclamation of 1963 the Negro people still are not free. He said: "I have a dream that one day the nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal.'"

The *N.Y. Times* commented editorially (Aug. 29, 1963): "The huge assemblage of Negro and white citizens in Washington yesterday to demand equality in all aspects of American life embodied in concept and in execution, the noblest tradition of our democracy. . . . The discipline maintained by the civil rights pilgrims was as impressive as their dedication. That so vast a movement could be carried out with such decorum is a tribute to the responsibility of both leaders and followers."

The marchers standing before the Lincoln Memorial "in the centennial year of emancipation" took a pledge "in support of all actions undertaken in good faith in accord with the time-honored tradition of nonviolent protest, of peaceful assembly and petition" through the courts and the legislative process.

Call on Kennedy: After the demonstration, the largest the nation's

capital had ever seen, 10 civil rights leaders met with President Kennedy who said he had been impressed with "the deep fervor and quiet dignity" of the marchers: "The cause of 20 million Negroes has been advanced by the program conducted so appropriately before the nation's shrine to the Great Emancipator."

Among the leaders who met with the President was Pres. Walter Reuther of the United Automobile Workers. But the AFL-CIO executive council refused to endorse the demonstration even though large numbers of trade unionists participated. A. Philip Randolph, President of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters and an AFL-CIO Vice President, had first suggested the idea of a massive march-on-Washington and was the chairman of the joint committee of civil rights groups that organized it.

It was estimated that at least 40,000 representatives of churches and synagogues were in the march along with 200 religious leaders.

The day before the march Dr. W. E. B. DuBois had died in Ghana in his 93rd year, and his name was called by one of the speakers. The marchers knew that "he had carried the banner at their head for over half a century," as Herbert Aptheker put it in his *Soul of the Republic: The Negro Today*.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was signed into law by President Johnson on July 2. Hailed as a new bill of rights for everyone regardless of race, creed or color, it bans discrimination and segregation in employment and in places of public accommodation. It provides some safeguards for registration and voting, and gives the Attorney General more authority to prohibit segregation in public schools.

The 44th annual report of the American Civil Liberties Union commented: "The national civil rights consensus, which established the base for this overdue legislative action, was built on years of struggle by the Negro community and their white allies to end second-class citizenship. The long-range hopes placed in the new law did not mean an immediate end to discrimination and segregation. Harassment, intimidation and physical beating of Negroes and civil rights workers continued, which pointed up a glaring lack in the bill: the need to improve the federal civil rights law by strengthening provisions barring police brutality or other official misconduct."

Under the Act, the Community Relations Service was established to settle racial disputes. In a little over 4 months it had handled 69 cases in 23 states, and reported it had entered 6 disputes involving employment and labor practices; 8 in the field of housing and real estate; 4 involving law enforcement; 21 in the field of public accommodations; 4

in public facilities; 12 in school desegregation; 17 involving community tension and 4 miscellaneous cases. Of the 69 cases, 38 were in the South and 31 in the North and West.

LeRoy Collins, former Governor of Florida, the director of the Community Relations Service, reported Feb. 3, 1965, that a recent survey by the Service in the major cities in 19 states not having their own laws on public accommodations showed there had been desegregation in more than two-thirds of the hotels, motels, chain restaurants, theaters, sports facilities, parks and libraries.

Long, Lonely Road: But despite the progress since the law was passed, he said, "the nation is still a long, lonely way down the road from the full enjoyment of civil rights by all citizens. Americans still are being degraded, cheated, threatened, terrorized and even brutally murdered—for no other reason than that they are Negroes or allies of Negroes."

Employment Opportunity: Under the new law, employers, employment agencies and unions are barred from discriminating on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin or sex. The law covers all union hiring halls, employers with 100 or more employes, and unions with 100 or more members in industries affecting interstate commerce. In July 1966 minimum coverage under the Act in relation to job discrimination will drop to 75 employes or members; a year later to 50, and thereafter to 25 or more.

The new law also prohibits discrimination in pay or other benefits. Unions may not discriminate in membership or job referral or segregate members by race. All apprenticeship and training programs must be free of discrimination.

These employment provisions of the Act were regarded by NAACP lawyers as weak, cumbersome and probably unworkable. And CORE officials predicted the operations of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, headed by Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., would be tangled in red tape.

DESEGREGATION IN SOUTHERN SCHOOLS

The U.S. Supreme Court on May 17, 1954, called for "all deliberate speed" in the desegregation of public schools in the U.S. Some 10 years later it was found by the Southern Education Reporting Service that although the number of Negroes in schools with whites in 11 southern states had doubled during 1964, the total involved still represented only about 2% of Negro enrollment in those states.

Here are the figures showing the insignificant percentages of Negroes in school with whites in public elementary and high schools in 6 of these southern states where there has been the most resistance to de-

segregation: Alabama, .032%; Georgia, .377%; Louisiana, 1.12%; Mississippi, .02% (representing only 58 Negroes); North Carolina, 1.41%; South Carolina, .10%.

Slow Progress: The improvement in the southern and border regions combined since 1960 is shown in the following figures: In 1960 only 6% of Negroes enrolled were in schools with whites; in 1961, 6.9%; in 1962, 7.8%; in 1963, 9.2%, and in 1964, 10.8%.

The contrast between the southern and border states is significant. For in the 6 border states by the end of 1964 more than half (54.8%) of the 520,000 Negro students were enrolled in desegregated elementary and high schools.

During the 1963-64 school year, two of the three "holdout" states, Alabama and South Carolina, desegregated at the elementary and high school levels for the first time, and Mississippi only in the school year 1964-65.

Writing in *American Education* (Jan. 1965) Erwin Knoll, Washington correspondent for the Southern Education Reporting Service, noted that in the 11th year since the Supreme Court decision on school desegregation, "some desegregation has come to 583 of the 2,989 school districts in the 11 states of the Deep South. The number of desegregated districts ranges from 3 in Louisiana and 4 in Mississippi to 292 in Texas. The South has 734 school districts with either all-white or all-Negro enrollments and 1,672 biracial districts in which no desegregation whatever has taken place."

He points out also that the number of desegregated districts "are deceptive, for much of the compliance has been token, at best. Though more than a fourth of the biracial districts in the 11 Southern States are listed as desegregated, well under 2% of the Negro pupils in these states are attending classes with white children. The percentage has been rising almost imperceptibly since 1954. This year, slightly more than 50,000 of the 2.9 million Negro pupils in the South are directly benefiting from" the 1954 decision and its painfully slow implementation.

During the 1964-65 school term there were 5,973 elementary and high school districts in the border and Southern states combined, of which 3,023 were either all white or all Negro with the remaining 2,950 biracial. But of these only 1,282 had desegregated, 42 of them in policy only. In only 1,240 were Negroes actually attending the same schools with whites.

Economic Pressure: Enforcement of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was expected to result in more rapid desegregation. For the 11 Southern states receive almost \$300 million a year in federal assistance for school programs, and were to get even more under the federal school aid law passed in 1965. A *N.Y. Times* survey (Jan. 18, 1965) concluded that although the federal agencies will meet with some resistance, their

officials believe that "school systems will ultimately desegregate rather than risk having the flow of federal money stopped."

Early in May, U.S. Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppell set the fall of 1967 as the target date for integration of all grades of any school system that draws federal funds. For the 1965-66 year aid applicants must integrate at least 4 grades and also begin integrating school teaching staffs and school buses.

SCHOOL SEGREGATION IN THE NORTH

In his article in *American Education* (Jan. 1965) Erwin Knoll says that at the time of the 1954 Supreme Court ruling, "Certainly Northerners, complacently confident that their schools had long been 'integrated', did not anticipate the mass demonstrations and boycotts that would be mounted in protest against racial imbalance and substandard classroom conditions."

He refers to the *de facto* segregation of schools in the North based on discrimination in housing. The so-called "neighborhood school" concept has been increasingly under attack because it contributes to the perpetuation of segregated schools.

In Chicago, for example, where controversy flared up over racial imbalances in the schools and the inadequacies of the predominantly Negro schools, Knoll reports that a 5-man panel headed by Philip M. Hauser, University of Chicago sociologist, proposed "enlarged elementary school zones to promote more biracial classes, 'open' (city wide) enrollment in secondary schools, better integration of teaching staffs and across-the-board efforts to improve the quality of the school program."

In Portland, Oregon, a 43-man Committee on Race and Education in 1964 stated that the schools of that city were not providing equal educational opportunities for children of all races. It said: "Our studies indicate that our schools in their present educational practices are not achieving their purpose for students from culturally deprived circumstances and this is particularly true for Negro students."

In Buffalo 16 elementary schools and 1 junior high school were still nearly 100% Negro in 1965. The N.Y. State Commissioner of Education ordered the Buffalo Board of Education to end racial imbalance by September 1965.

Action Against Segregation: In Cleveland, Ohio, most major struggles centered around protests against the building of new schools in areas where they would perpetuate segregation patterns. In one demonstration April 7, 1964, at a school construction site Rev. Bruce W. Klunder, a young white Presbyterian minister, was killed by a bulldozer. He was the vice chairman of the local CORE group and associate execu-

tive secretary of the Student Christian Union at Western Reserve University.

School boycotts and protests were conducted by Negro and civil rights groups in early 1964, for example, in Chicago, Cincinnati and Boston, as well as in smaller towns such as Cambridge, Md. and Chester, Pa.

In New York City: Report by New York City board of education in March 1965 listed 187 schools as "segregated" where at least 85% of the enrollment is Negro and/or Puerto Rican. This is an increase of 18 such schools in one year and more than double the figure for 1957. Biggest increase was in elementary schools which rose from 134 "segregated" in 1963 to 148 today. And for the first time nonwhites outnumber whites in the city's elementary grades.

A school boycott was conducted on Feb. 3, 1964, by the Citywide Committee for Integrated Schools in which the NAACP, CORE and several other groups were united. Rev. Milton A. Galamison of Brooklyn headed the committee and the boycott was directed by Bayard Rustin, director of the 1963 March on Washington. About 464,000 pupils, largely from Negro schools, joined in the protest. This was at least 350,000 more than the normal absentees. The general purpose of the boycott was to protest against the Board of Education's slowness in doing anything "substantial and meaningful" to break up *de facto* segregation in the school system.

A second boycott was conducted March 16 with nearly 170,000 out in addition to normal absentees. This time national CORE and the NAACP withheld sponsorship.

In Jan. 1965 Rev. Galamison led a much smaller boycott which lasted several days during which he received a suspended sentence for harboring pupils in violation of the state compulsory education law. When he violated the terms he was sent to prison for 3 days. About 28 schools were involved in this boycott and about 6,000 students.

Allen Report: The report of State Education Commissioner Allen made public in 1964 after the second boycott, stated that "Puerto Rican, Negro and other students in public schools . . . suffer extensive and serious ethnic segregation." It said that the New York City Board of Education's "efforts have had no measurable effect" upon segregated schooling, and that its proposals "would not reduce current levels of school segregation or prevent future increases."

Later reports made by the city authorities in 1965 agreed that the Allen proposals were a good basis for policy. But the city's proposed measures, while taking some steps in the right direction, were not regarded as satisfactory by militant civil rights leaders.

Despite such criticism, however, it was admitted that New York City's efforts to promote integration have been more advanced than those of many other Northern cities. Such improvements as open enroll-

ment, zoning changes, pairing of schools and some busing of students were among the first steps taken in 1965 in the direction of achieving a school system that combines integration and quality education.

MISSISSIPPI SUMMER PROJECT

In his book, *SNCC: The New Abolitionists*, Prof. Howard Zinn of Boston University reported that a thousand students from all over the country were planning in 1964 "in a program directed by Bob Moses and the Council of Federated Organizations, to spend the summer in Mississippi, establishing schools, setting up community centers, registering voters. They would join a reinforced group of staff members of SNCC, CORE and the NAACP. And meanwhile, the state of Mississippi was mobilizing its police forces to act as it had before, on an even larger scale."

The Mississippi Summer Project (1964) of COFO was the outcome of these preparations. It included as many as 1,500 in the course of the summer, some staying for the full season, others for only a few days. Most of them were college students but there were scores of social workers, lawyers, doctors, teachers, ministers, all of them engaged in one way or another in the establishing of Freedom Schools, Community Centers and Political Education. The latter project consisted of voter registration drives in 40 towns and villages either for voting in the regular Mississippi election or in the special registration drive for the new Freedom Democratic Party.

At least 30 Freedom Schools were established, attended by over 3,000 Negro youth. They were designed to instruct the students in Negro history along with reading, writing and mathematics. They gave remedial academic work as well as vocational training.

The 24 Community Centers conducted literacy classes and training in various skills for adults and arts and crafts courses and recreation programs for children. For example, in the one at Meridian, there was not only a nursery school but a sewing instruction program for adults. In Ruleville the women were taught health subjects, first aid, reading, writing and Negro history.

Negro Courage: Richard J. Bernstein, who teaches philosophy at Yale University, in reviewing the work of the summer project in *The Nation* (Dec. 28, 1964) wrote:

"The Mississippi project would never have gotten off the ground if the Negroes themselves had not been willing to risk their jobs, property and lives. It was they who found the churches and other buildings for the Freedom Schools and Community Centers, who attended the schools in the oppressive summer heat, who took the COFO workers into their homes. The courage that this required can scarcely be estimated. Every

Negro who became identified with the freedom movement was risking economic and physical reprisal. In Mississippi there is no sanctuary for the Negro; the 'law' is not a source of protection but the chief instrument of intimidation and persecution."

He concluded: "The great insight of the COFO workers was that help must be genuine help. It cannot be paternalistic. . . . It can work—and it is working—when one is willing to move in with and function directly with the Negro community."

Legal Aid: COFO's campaign was aided by four groups of attorneys totaling about 150 who came to Mississippi during the summer. They included the group from the National Lawyers Guild with an office in Jackson and bases in Meridian, Greenwood and Hattiesburg; the Lawyers Constitutional Defense Committee, with which attorneys from the American Civil Liberties Union were associated; the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, which aided the 325 ministers sent in during the summer by the National Council of Churches; and the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund. There was also an unofficial COFO Legal Advisory Committee, including William M. Kunstler of the New York Law School who initiated several broad suits including one against the state poll tax.

The National Lawyers Guild sent a letter to the head of the state bar association explaining, "Our concern in Mississippi is to attempt to redress the lack of available lawyers in Mississippi ready, willing and able to handle civil rights cases."

The Guild reported that its 66 lawyers saved COFO workers "countless days that might have been spent in jail, as well as many dollars in fines." As a result of their mere presence Atty. George Crockett of Detroit, who helped plan the Guild work, stated that, "There have not been nearly so many arrests this summer and certainly not as much police brutality and harassment as did exist here last summer." And the legal climate in the courts of Mississippi changed somewhat for the better.

However, in a letter to the President of the American Bar Assn. in Aug. 1964 the Guild pointed out: "Perhaps the reality behind the system of justice in Mississippi for those who oppose the pattern of segregation may best be understood by the fact that only one lawyer (white) has responded to our direct written requests to hundreds of lawyers in Mississippi to accept civil rights cases. This courageous man has already begun to suffer the economic and social reprisals which have uniformly hounded Southern white lawyers who have associated themselves with the defense of these cases."

The COFO project did not end with the summer. Hundreds of students returned to their colleges but some stayed on and were joined by new volunteers working out of some 35 offices in the state with about

250 workers on the job at the end of the year. They were looking forward to another summer of similar work throughout the South, stressing especially the drive to get more Mississippi Negroes registered to vote.

TRIPLE LYNCHING OF RIGHTS WORKERS

Three dedicated workers in the civil rights cause were reported missing in Mississippi on June 21, 1964. They were Michael H. Schwerner, 24, a social worker of Brooklyn, N.Y.; Andrew Goodman, 20, a Queens College student of New York City and James E. Chaney, 21, of Meridian, Miss., a field secretary of the Council of Federated Organizations.

On the day of their disappearance they were on their way back to the Meridian office of COFO after investigating the burning down on June 16 of the Mt. Zion Baptist Church which was to have been used as a Freedom School in connection with the Mississippi Summer Project.

Police in Plot: They were stopped by police near Philadelphia, Miss. and Chaney, the driver, was held for speeding, the other two for investigation. Kept for several hours and unable to communicate with their organization they were released from the jail after Chaney had paid a \$20 fine. The deputy sheriff had them drive into a waiting group of some 20 killers who took them to a spot where they were murdered. Their bodies were buried 20 feet under an earthen dam then in construction on a farm about 6 miles southwest of Philadelphia.

On June 23 the burned out station wagon of the boys was found in a swamp about 10 miles north of Philadelphia. After weeks of searching, with the federal government offering a reward, the bodies were found on Aug. 4, 1964.

The Mississippi authorities took no action and brought no murder charges. Four months later the sheriff of Neshoba county and his deputy and 19 other white men, including several leaders of the Ku Klux Klan, were arrested. The federal complaint said that the deputy sheriff had arrested the 3 boys on a fictitious speeding charge and then released them so that other conspirators would intercept them and kill them. The government said that 10 of the conspirators were actually involved in the murder.

None of the 21 were charged with murder, a charge over which the federal government has no jurisdiction unless the crime is committed on government property. So 19 of the men were charged under an 1870 statute, with conspiracy to violate the civil rights of the victims. The other two were charged as accessories to the crime.

A U.S. Commissioner, holding that the confessions the government had obtained were only "hearsay," dismissed the charges. The government then presented evidence again to a federal grand jury and later, in

Jan. 1965, 18 of the racists were indicted. But an outspoken segregationist federal judge dismissed or reduced the charges to misdemeanors. The U.S. Supreme Court agreed to review the dismissal of the charges.

When the murder was confirmed, Robert and Carolyn Goodman, the parents of Andrew, said at a press conference: "Our grief, though personal, belongs to our nation. This tragedy is not private. It is part of the public conscience of our country. The values our son expressed in his simple action of going to Mississippi are still the bonds that bind this nation together—its Constitution, its law, its Bill of Rights."

NIGHTMARE IN MISSISSIPPI

A month before the election in 1964, 18 Democratic Congressmen called on the federal government to "take all necessary steps to prevent further violence and bloodshed" in Mississippi. They noted that in McComb alone 17 bombings, 32 arrests, 9 beatings and 4 church burnings had been reported since June.

Churches Bombed and Burned: At the same time the *N.Y. Times* (Oct. 6, 1964) noted editorially that "some 40 churches have been burned or bombed in Mississippi in the past six months." These incomplete figures were in line with those reported by other agencies, for example, that in this period 24 churches were destroyed in that state by arson, bombing and dynamite attacks and that 31 other buildings had been partly destroyed. Firebombings with bombs that exploded and caused fires were reported in 13 cities and towns of that state including Jackson, Vicksburg, Natchez, Meridian as well as McComb. Typical of countless such attacks were the following:

At Clinton, Miss. on June 26, after a white minister had spoken to a Negro Bible class, his church was burned. The office of a white moderate newspaper in Jackson was bombed on Aug. 27. When the Mayor of Natchez showed sympathy for the civil rights struggle his two offices were bombed on Sept. 14, and his home on Sept. 25.

Two children were injured on Sept. 20 in McComb when the home of Mrs. Aylene Quinn, local civil rights leader, was bombed. Two civil rights workers sleeping in the Freedom House at Vicksburg were cut by flying glass after an explosion on Oct. 4.

Law Officers Helped: Violence by white hoodlum members of the Ku Klux Klan, the Americans for the Preservation of the White Race, the White Citizens Councils and similar racist bodies was often aided and encouraged by so-called "law officers." Describing in the *Progressive* (Sept. 1964) the nightmare of official and unofficial terror against civil rights workers, Dr. Peter Weiss, Wisconsin University psychologist, who spent two weeks in Mississippi wrote: "There is hardly a SNCC staff member around who hasn't been clubbed, beaten, and drenched in his

own blood by the police and the young hoods who serve them. . . . Bombings, burnings, whippings, shootings, and job dismissals continue to occur with unfaltering regularity. It is appalling to find them appearing in the Northern press as 'scattered incidents.' To the Negroes of Mississippi and the COFO staff, these incidents are a nightmare reality that faces them daily. I cannot recall an instant of my visit in Mississippi that I was not afraid."

After giving details on the treatment of several civil rights workers he summarizes the violence associated with an attempt of a Negro to register to vote in that state: "You fight your way past the bottles and curses to the court house. Then you fight your way through a gauntlet of billy clubs up the steps to the registrar's office only to find that you cannot exercise your birthright as an American citizen. Then you fight your way back home again through the same mob. That night your house is bombed, and you stumble dazed and deaf into the front yard where a policeman stands spitting on your grass, trying to conceal his glee. Mississippi, 1964, is Germany, 1936, revisited."

OTHER KILLINGS OF NEGROES

During the years 1963-65 violent action against Negroes continued in many areas of the southern and border states, as well as in the North. Policemen as well as racist members of the Ku Klux Klan and the White Citizens Councils joined in the slaughter. Lawlessness and terror met the efforts of Negroes and their allies to exercise their constitutional rights. (See also sections on Mississippi Nightmare, Mississippi Summer Project, and Southern Voting Registration Struggles.)

Only a few of the typical crimes of the period are mentioned below:

Medgar W. Evers, Negro leader in Jackson, Miss., and state secretary of the NAACP, was ambushed and killed on the night of June 12, 1963, as he was entering his home. Byron de la Beckwith, a white salesman who preached white supremacy on his travels in the state, was charged with the murder and tried in Jan.-Feb. 1964. Witnesses traced the murder weapon to Beckwith and 39 men and women testified against him. The first trial ended in a hung jury, with a vote of 7 for acquittal and 5 for conviction. A second mistrial was declared on April 17 after an all-white jury deadlocked, reportedly 8 to 4, in favor of acquittal.

Birmingham Children: In Birmingham, Ala. on Sept. 15, 1963, four young Negro girls were killed in the dynamiting of the 16th Street Baptist Church. Three men were convicted, sentenced to 90 days and fined \$100 each, but the convictions were later reversed on appeal.

Louis Allen, 44-year-old Negro leader and a lumberjack, at Liberty, Miss., was found dead in his front yard Jan. 31, 1964, by one of his

sons. He had been shot three times with a shotgun. He had been warned that local whites were "out to get him" because he had witnessed the killing in 1961 of another Negro, Herbert Lee, who was active in the voter registration campaign.

Two young Negroes, Charles Moore, a college student, and Henry H. Dee, a laborer, both 19 years old, were killed on or about May 2, 1964. Their bodies were found in July 1964 in the Mississippi River near Tallulah, La. Authorities indicated that they had been beaten to death. Two white men, a truck driver and a paper mill employe of Meadville, Miss., were arrested Nov. 6, 1964, and charged with the murders. One of them was a self-admitted member of the Ku Klux Klan.

A Negro boy, James Powell, 15 years old, was shot and killed in New York City, July 16, 1964, by an off-duty policeman, Lt. Thomas R. Gilligan. On Sept. 1 Gilligan was cleared by a New York County grand jury which reported he was not criminally liable for the killing. Negro civil rights leaders attacked the exoneration of Gilligan as a failure of justice.

Army Reserve Officer: Lemuel Penn, Negro educator and Army Reserve officer, was killed by a sniper's shotgun blast, July 11, 1964, as he drove through Georgia. The shot was fired from another car as Penn and two other reserve officers were driving near Colbert. The three were returning from a tour of duty at an Army Reserve training camp at Fort Benning, Ga.

Four members of the Ku Klux Klan were arrested, and 3 indicted for this murder. They were acquitted by an all-white jury. Later 6 involved in the murder were indicted for conspiring to injure and oppress Penn. But the indictments were dismissed by a federal judge.

MISSISSIPPI FREEDOM DEMOCRATIC PARTY

An outgrowth of the political education and registration activities of the Council of Federated Organizations in 1964 was the organization of a new means of political expression for the disfranchised Negroes of Mississippi. This effort to gain some political power took the form of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party which held a state convention in Jackson Aug. 6 with delegates from more than half of Mississippi's 82 counties.

Delegates were elected to the Democratic National Convention at Atlantic City. But when the FDP delegation of 64 Negroes and 4 whites tried to get seated there in place of the "regular" lily-white delegation they met with an offer to have only seats at-large created in the convention for 2 of their leaders, Aaron Henry and the Rev. Edwin King. The compromise proposed that both delegations give a pledge of loyalty to

the National Democratic ticket and that the convention rule should be changed to require non-discriminatory state delegations at the following convention in 1968. The compromise was not acceptable to either side. The FDP considered it only a token victory and merely a "way out" for the Administration in its desire to hold white southern votes.

Despite the intense efforts of the COFO summer freedom project and the new party to get Negroes registered to vote in the November election not more than 2,000 had been added to the Mississippi rolls. To dramatize the situation and to show the support of the Mississippi Negroes for the national ticket, the FDP staged a mock election in which all those of voting age were encouraged to cast their ballots. The 4-day vote was held just before the regular election with some 200 civil rights COFO workers and 75 Eastern and Middle Western college student volunteers helping with the operation.

"Freedom Vote": Ballot boxes were set up for the "freedom vote" in barbershops, cafes, cleaning establishments, churches and even in automobiles to reach backwoods areas. On the ballot appeared the names of Johnson and Humphrey and the 4 Negro congressional candidates of the new party who had been disqualified by the State Election Committee dominated by the Jim Crow establishment. Some 60,000 votes were counted.

Congressional Challenge: The next move was to challenge the election of the 4 Democratic and Republican congressmen from Mississippi who had been elected on November 3. The legal step was made on the ground that these reactionaries did not represent the people of Mississippi and that their election was invalid because Negroes were not allowed to vote in almost every part of the state.

The challenge was brought by the 3 women who had been on the FDP ticket—Mrs. Fannie Lou Hamer, Mrs. Annie Devine and Mrs. Victoria Gray.

Meantime, as Congress opened on Jan. 4, 1965, more than 600 members of the FDP—Negro farmers, sharecroppers, housewives, workers—were in Washington in support of the challenge to the seating of the racist Representatives from Mississippi. On that day almost a third of the House members, 149, had voted against seating the 5. A vote of 218, or more than half of the members, is necessary to unseat.

Rep. William F. Ryan (D., N.Y.) who introduced the "fairness" resolution told a FDP meeting that "today is the last time Congress should seat as members men who gained their seats through violence, intimidation, economic reprisal and murder." The *N.Y. Times* (Jan. 1, 1965) said, "The House can and should refuse to seat the 5 Mississippi Representatives pending a full investigation by one of its own committees and a final determination in the courts of the validity of their election." However, it opposed the claims of James Farmer and others that the

3 women were actually elected and should have House floor privileges while their "challenge" was pending.

Five northern liberal Republicans who opposed seating the Mississippi delegation joined in a statement saying the Democratic leadership had "effectively condoned the disfranchisement of more than 400,000 American citizens in Mississippi and missed an opportunity to rectify the wrong."

The challenge continued in Mississippi as the FDP assembled the evidence to show the illegality of the election. For the first time since Reconstruction the segregationist practices of Mississippi officials were being challenged in public hearings as the FDP pressed its efforts to unseat the 5 white congressmen.

Witnesses to Terror: At these hearings Negroes were able to testify to the systematic terror directed against them when they tried to register to vote—threats and intimidation, loss of jobs and loss of credit, phony arrests, and every form of terror.

Some 15,000 pages of testimony of some 600 witnesses in 33 counties were taken by 133 volunteer attorneys and filed with the Clerk of the House to support the claim that the 5 Congressmen were elected illegally. (See *The Nation*, May 17, 1965, "The Mississippi Challenge" by George Slaff, one of the volunteer lawyers.)

SOUTHERN VOTING REGISTRATION STRUGGLES

The main issue in the Negro revolutionary struggles of 1964-65 was the right to vote. It was centered in Mississippi and in the Black Belt of Alabama. As of Feb. 1965 there were no Negroes registered in all of Lowndes County, Ala., and none in Wilcox. In Dallas County, which includes Selma, only 2% had been registered. (In one county in Mississippi there were none registered and in one in Louisiana only 1.7%.)

The full story of Negro registration is kept up to date by the Voter Education Project of the Southern Regional Council, Atlanta, Ga. As of the end of Nov. 1964 the total of unregistered Negroes of voting age in the 11 Southern states numbered over 2.8 million. Thus, despite the registration drive of the election year 1964, only small numbers of Negroes were registered to vote in the Deep South. In the 11 southern states together 43.3% of the eligible Negroes were registered compared with 73.2% of the whites. In Louisiana only 32% of the eligible Negroes were registered; in Alabama 23%, and in Mississippi only 6.7%.

Chain of Slavery: In summarizing some of the "several links in the chain of slavery borne by the disfranchised Negro of the rural South," Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. pointed to the "gestapo-like control of county and local government" by racist sheriffs, and the "slow pace of the registrar and the limited number of days and hours during which the

office is open" for applications for registration of Negro voters. He mentioned also the "literacy test," administered unfairly against Negroes, and the poll tax requirement in state and local voting. (Industrial Union Dept., AFL-CIO, *Agenda*, March 1965.)

On top of these barriers thrown up to hold down Negro voting registration are a whole series of economic and related difficulties. In his recent book *Federalism and Civil Rights*, Burke Marshall, former U.S. Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, lists some of the routine harassments faced by Negroes seeking to exercise their right to vote in the South. These include "cancellation of sharecropper arrangements, refusal of credit by banks and stores, a retaliatory boycott by suppliers, physical violence by a sheriff, unwarranted arrests or other police intimidation, and loss of employment."

In their efforts to register to vote in southern states hundreds of Negroes during the past two years have been beaten, arrested and charged with "unlawful assemblage." Some have given their lives. Here are only a few examples of the persecution of Negroes in the voter registration campaigns.

During the summer of 1963 more than 200 Negroes of Americus, Ga., were arrested in voter registration drives. On April 25, 1963, Ralph Allen, a worker for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee was beaten on the street after he had taken a Negro woman to vote at the Sumter County courthouse.

At Selma, Ala., about 320 Negroes were arrested between Sept. 15 and Oct. 2, 1963, when they carried signs saying "Register to Vote." The Department of Justice charged the White Citizens Councils with intimidation of potential Negro voters. (See more on Selma below.)

At Dawson, Ga. Mrs. Carolyn Daniels was registering Negroes to vote. Her home was bombed Dec. 8, 1963, by night riders. Her leg and foot were injured by their bullets.

John Lewis, SNCC chairman, was arrested Sept. 25, 1963, for leading students of Selma University in Alabama to register. He was convicted of "unlawful assembly," sentenced to 180 days in prison and a \$300 fine, and later released on bail.

In Jackson, Miss., a SNCC field secretary had taken 17 Negroes to the Holmes County courthouse to register in April 1963. They had been met by 6 armed white men who kept all but 2 from entering the building. Deputy Sheriff Andrew P. Smith had arrested 4 field secretaries of SNCC and a Negro farmer on charges they had "firebombed the farmer's home to stir up sympathy for a voter registration drive." These charges were later dropped.

Selma Concentration: The campaign for voter registration was concentrated again at Selma in early Feb. 1965. Rev. M. L. King and hundreds of others, including many high school students, were arrested

when they tried to march to the county courthouse to demand voting rights. Up to Feb. 3 none had been registered. But those arrested within a few days in Selma and nearby Marion totaled 2,800.

It was only the beginning, as Selma, along with Montgomery and Marion, remained the focal points of the civil rights struggle during the following weeks marked by 3 killings, countless bloody beatings and historic marches and demonstrations.

On Sunday, March 7, Rev. M. L. King, leading about 600 Negroes and a few white sympathizers, started on a march from Selma to Montgomery to protest the denial of voting rights to Negroes.

State troopers and mounted deputies bombarded the marchers with tear gas and then attacked them with clubs, bull whips and ropes, injuring men and women alike. Gov. George C. Wallace had ordered the march stopped, declaring, "We can't give in one inch" on the demand for equal voting rights.

The clubbed and bleeding marchers were driven back almost a mile to the starting point at Brown's Chapel Church in Selma. Ambulances were driven in relays between the church and the hospital, carrying men, women and children, suffering from head wounds and tear gas. The attack was described as the most savage one since the Birmingham demonstrations were suppressed in June 1963.

Undaunted, another attempt to march was made March 9 by King, leading over 1,500 in all, including many white ministers from the North. But state troopers were ordered to enforce a court injunction against the march. The leaders finally complied after kneeling for prayer near the highway and then returning to the church.

Rev. James Reeb Killed: On the evening of this day a Boston Unitarian minister, Rev. James J. Reeb, 38, and two other ministers were attacked by 3 white racists on a street in Selma. Felled by a savage blow on the head with a club, Reeb died 2 days later in the hospital. Services in his memory were held all over the North including a rally of some 30,000 on Boston Common.

The death of Rev. Reeb, who left a wife and 4 children, sent a wave of revulsion over the U.S. that stirred President Johnson to make an appeal to Congress March 15 advocating a law to "strike down restrictions to voting in *all* elections—Federal, state and local—which have been used to deny Negroes the right to vote."

March to Montgomery: After an injunction had been ordered by a Federal District Judge on March 17 upholding the right of the marchers to proceed to Montgomery, Gov. Wallace claimed the state did not have finances or manpower enough to handle the security effort required to protect the march. So President Johnson federalized nearly 1,900 National Guardsmen in addition to 500 regular troops and other federal agents. With this protection the final march started from Selma on

March 21 with some 3,200 led by Dr. King, Ralph Bunche and other political, labor and church leaders from the North, including Mrs. Constance Baker Motley, recently elected Borough President of New York City. Number of marchers was reduced by court order to 300 when a 2-lane highway was reached the first day. But they were joined again by several thousands on the outskirts of Montgomery. The march continued up to the State capitol building on the 25th, merging with a mighty demonstration of more than 25,000, with people from all over the country joining in the final rally. Rev. King, addressing the throng, said that Selma had become "a shining moment in the conscience of man."

Gov. Wallace refused to meet the delegation with the petition which said: "We have come not only 5 days and 50 miles but we have come from 3 centuries of suffering and hardship. . . . We have come . . . to declare that we must have our freedom *now*. We must have the right to vote; we must have equal protection of the law and an end to police brutality." Five days later a delegation got to see the Governor who promised to give the petition "careful consideration."

Murder of Mrs. Liuzzo: A few hours after the great Montgomery rally death struck again on the highway. Mrs. Viola Gregg Liuzzo, a 38-year old mother of 5 from Detroit, was murdered while driving back to Montgomery after taking some civil rights workers to Selma. A Negro youth was in the front seat of the car and witnessed the volley of shots from the killers' car. Later, on March 26, President Johnson appeared on TV to deplore "the horrible crime," to announce that 4 Ku Klux Klansmen had been arrested, charged with the crime and to say he was requesting Congress to investigate the KKK, "a hooded society of bigots."

A month earlier a third victim in this Alabama voting rights drive had been the young Negro James Lee Jackson who died Feb. 26 after being shot on Feb. 18 by a state trooper in Marion, Ala. He had been sitting in a cafe after troopers had broken up a march to the courthouse in connection with the voting rights drive. Rushing into the cafe one trooper seized Jackson, while another shot him. He was refused treatment at the Marion Hospital and taken to one in Selma where he died of complications. *The Student Voice* (March 26, 1965) commented, "The killer of Jimmie Lee Jackson is yet to be prosecuted."

Voting Rights Law: A federal voting rights act was passed by Congress in 1965 and signed by the President in August. It reaffirmed the guarantee of the 15th Amendment to the Constitution that no citizen's right to vote shall be denied or abridged because of race or color. Main purpose of the bill was to stop the use of literacy tests, "knowledge of government" tests and other restrictive practices and regulations used to prevent Negroes from qualifying as voters. It did not, however, prohibit the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting in state or local

elections. Four states—Alabama, Mississippi, Virginia and Texas—still have this requirement.

The Act was considered by experts as falling far short of achieving universal suffrage. (See "Small Fruit of a Bold Promise," by Prof. William W. Van Alstyne, *The Nation*, April 19, 1965.)

SEGREGATION IN HOUSING

In its 44th annual report (1963-1964) the American Civil Liberties Union noted that, "Fair housing legislation was buffeted by two conflicting trends. Referendums in several cities and states tried to nullify fair housing laws, and in some places succeeded. At the same time, a number of cities were added to the growing list of places with non-discriminatory housing statutes. Nationwide interest focussed on California where voters approved a state constitutional amendment that nullified an existing fair housing law and barred any future local or state legislation against discrimination in housing."

This reactionary move in California took the form of Proposition 13, which was proposed by the California Real Estate Association. The amendment would repeal the Rumford Fair Housing Act passed in 1963 and all other state fair housing laws by declaring that the state cannot deny any person the right "to decline to sell, to lease or rent" his property to such persons "as he, in his absolute discretion chooses." The passage of this proposition froze into the state constitution a provision that, in effect, permanently legalized housing discrimination.

The ACLU report noted that this drive in California "was part of a national effort by the National Real Estate Association to thwart legislative action. . . . Several major cities withdrew anti-bias housing ordinances, emphasizing the tremendous educational work still needed to win the acceptance of non-discriminatory housing."

Segregated Servicemen: Even among Negro servicemen who live near military bases in the U.S., racial discrimination in housing persists. A nationwide survey by the Pentagon showed that there was just as much housing discrimination in the North as in the South. It was found that communities near 90% of 305 installations practiced housing discrimination against Negro servicemen and their families. It was considered "the most unyielding" form of discrimination affecting Negroes in uniform.

Some commanders of military bases reported that Negro servicemen might have to travel as much as 28 miles to find decent accommodations for their families; "others suggested that they could find nearby facilities if they paid more than whites, and still others reported Negroes could not find satisfactory housing under any circumstances." (*N.Y. Times*, March 26, 1965.)

In addition to the 196 base commanders who reported outright discrimination, 78, whose bases were chiefly in urban centers, reported that Negroes "could find adequate housing, but only in certain segregated sections."

Negro Ghettos: The so-called open market for housing, even when achieved by struggle for desegregation and fair housing laws, affects mainly middle-income Negroes. As Nat Hentoff says in his book, *The New Equality* (1964), it has little relevance to the poor Negroes in the slums:

"In Phoenix 97% of nearly all that city's Negroes are in a radius of a mile of the railroad tracks or the river bend. In Omaha all but a minute number of the 30,000 Negroes there are crowded into the near North Side. In Newark some 83% live in 6 of the city's dozen neighborhoods, including 3 of Newark's most deteriorated areas. Except for 1,500 of them, Boston's 63,000 Negroes are jammed into a boomerang-shaped, decaying area of adjoining neighborhoods in Roxbury, North Dorchester, and the South End. In Indianapolis 89% of the Negroes are in Center Township, the 'inner city', in homes that are 75 to 100 years old. Nationally, as Tom Kahn has reported 'one out of every 6 Negro dwelling units is dilapidated, obsolete or otherwise substandard, as compared with one in 32 white dwellings.'"

Hentoff concluded that in 1964, "no *basic* change has taken place in the design reported in 1961 by the U.S. Commission on Human Rights: 'There is an ever-increasing concentration of nonwhites in racial ghettos, largely in the decaying centers of our cities—while a "white noose" of new suburban housing grows up around them.'"

Racial segregation has actually been rising a little, a population expert, Karl Taeuber of the University of Wisconsin, has reported in *Social Problems* (Summer 1964). His study of census figures discloses that in 109 cities surveyed the residential segregation ratio rose from 85.2% in 1940 to 86.1% in 1960. (The ratio was based on the percentage of blocks containing only whites or only nonwhites.)

In his study, *Segregation, Subsidies, and Megalopolis*, issued in 1964 by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Bernard Weissbourd says that no plan for reconstituting American cities can succeed unless it provides for the breakdown of racial segregation. "If America is not prepared to accept interracial communities, there is little hope of arresting the decline of the city."

He calls racial segregation one of the most serious threats to the future health of any large city. "Not only is the Negro population of our cities increasing in numbers but housing for Negroes is becoming increasingly segregated." And this segregated housing is the worst reported in official housing surveys. For example, in the Central Harlem area of New York

City the proportion of housing classified as "substandard" is still around 50%, while for the city as a whole it is about 15%.

POLICE TERROR IN THE NORTH

Police brutality against Negroes in Northern cities is an old story. Particularly in the Negro ghetto of Harlem, New York City, where, for example, on April 17, 1964, a group of 6 teenagers, accused of overturning a fruitstand, were brutally beaten by police. A bystander lost his eye when a policeman hit him with a nightstick.

Three days later the same group of teenagers was arrested and charged with killing Margit Sugar, a Harlem clothes dealer. They were beaten repeatedly by police in an effort to extract a signed confession.

After the arrest and beating of the teenagers the Harlem Defense Council was formed to aid these and other victims of police brutality.

Later, on July 16, a 15-year old Negro boy, James Powell, was shot by an off-duty policeman, Thomas Gilligan. (See page 86.) The boy's school friends demonstrated for 2 days in front of the school where he was murdered. Then on July 18 the Harlem branch of the Progressive Labor Movement held a street meeting at which some of the mothers of the "Harlem Six" spoke along with Harlem Defense Council members.

About the time this rally ended another one 10 blocks away led by 2 CORE chapters closed with a march on the local police station and a sit-down demanding the arrest of Gilligan. This led to the order to club and beat the protesters and the subsequent attacks for 3 days and nights on every group of citizens gathered to protest the terror.

The Harlem Defense Council called for a peaceful demonstration on July 25 to present the demands of the people. The Police Commissioner banned the meeting. When the HDC and the Harlem PLM headed by William Epton attempted to carry out the march he and his attorney, Conrad Lynn, were arrested, charged with "disorderly conduct" and "unlawful assembly." On Aug. 5 Epton was arrested again charged with "criminal anarchy."

Grand Jury Harassment: Hearings by an all-white grand jury began in August and continued into the Spring of 1965. The prosecutor, in his search for material to indict Epton and the PLM, demanded that some 30 persons called before it give the names of friends and political associates. When they refused, a dozen were arrested and charged with criminal contempt, and sentenced to prison terms ranging from 30 days to 4 months. Other were given 30-day civil contempt sentences.

Meantime attorneys for PLM moved in federal court to enjoin the grand jury from further intimidating activity pending outcome of a \$400,000 damage suit filed in Feb. 1965 charging that the grand jury sys-

tem, the state criminal anarchy law and the "immunity from persecution" law are all unconstitutional.

The police violence in Harlem and the subsequent grand jury operations led to the formation in early 1965 of the Committee to Defend Resistance to Ghetto Life (CERGE). Its purpose is to expose the repressive policies of the New York City Administration against the people of Harlem and to defend the "Harlem Six" and the victims of the grand jury inquisition. Among its national sponsors are Carl and Anne Braden, Maxwell Geismar, Vincent Hallinan, LeRoi Jones, J. P. Morray, Truman Nelson and Paul Sweezy.

Other Northern Protests: The "riots" in Harlem were co-incident with similar outbreaks in Brooklyn's Bedford-Stuyvesant section starting July 20, and in Rochester, N.Y. on July 24-25. In August they occurred in Jersey City, Elizabeth and Paterson, N.J., and in Philadelphia. Also in Dixmoor, Ill. (a Chicago suburb), in August, and in Seaside, Ore., and Hampton Beach, N.H., in September.

Except in Harlem where they lasted several days the big city disturbances usually occurred on one or two nights and tapered off on the third night. And they all followed instances of police action against Negroes.

A summary of the 7 main "riot situations" by *U.S. News & World Report* (Sept. 9, 1964) reported 5 killed (4 in Rochester, 1 in New York), 952 injured (350 of them in Rochester and 341 in Philadelphia) and 2,484 arrested.

Background of "Riots": Fred Powledge reported in the *N.Y. Times*, Aug. 6, 1964, that in Harlem "the real theme is utter despair brought on by crowded living conditions, inadequate schools, and a firm belief that the rest of the city wishes Harlem did not exist."

The F.B.I. itself, reporting on the "racial disturbances" in 9 places, admitted that they were in areas "characterized by miserable living conditions, houses that are badly maintained, many of them rat infested and filthy. . . . Idleness, frustration, poverty and lack of opportunity are part of the atmosphere many people in these districts breathe." (*N.Y. Times*, Sept. 27, 1964.) The same report stated that, "No evidence was found that riots were organized on a national basis by any single person, group of persons, or organization."

MONROE FRAMEUP REVERSED

In Monroe, N.C., Mrs. Willie Mae Mallory, 36-year-old Negro, was sentenced on Feb. 28, 1964 to a prison term of 16 to 20 years for "kidnapping" a white couple in 1961. Also of Monroe, Richard Crowder, 21, was sentenced to two terms of 7 to 10 years and Harold Reape, 19, was sentenced to 5 to 7 years in prison on the same charges.

The one white defendant, John C. Lowry, 22, of Flushing, N.Y., re-

ceived two 3-to-5 year sentences. Superior Court Judge Walter F. Brock pronounced two concurrent sentences in each case. All 4 defendants have appealed their cases to higher courts.

In the midst of racist violence led by the Ku Klux Klan on Aug. 27, 1961, the Negro leaders had detained for a few hours a white couple who later were released unharmed.

Anti-Negro feeling ran so high in Monroe in Aug. 1961 that the Negro leader, Robert F. Williams, would almost certainly have been lynched if he had not escaped as a refugee. (See *Labor Fact Book* 16.)

Mrs. Mallory fled to Cleveland, Ohio, where she remained free for two years under a \$7,000 bail bond. But she was later extradited and brought to trial in Feb. 1964 in Monroe. The Committee to Aid the Monroe Defendants has pointed out that they were tried and convicted by an all-white jury on trumped-up charges before a court "notorious for its injustice to Negro and civil rights fighters."

On Jan. 29, 1965, the North Carolina Supreme Court reversed the decision on the ground that Negroes had been systematically excluded from the grand jury that drew the indictment. But a grand jury in Monroe, N.C. in May 1965 re-indicted Mrs. Mallory and 3 other defendants.

V. CIVIL LIBERTIES

Summing up the general civil liberties situation, from the viewpoint of a progressive labor union in April 1965, the Report of the Officers to the 16th Biennial Convention of the International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union said:

"While the fight for civil rights has staggered the nation with its intensity, there has not been much to cheer about in the current state of civil liberties. Some gains have been made in the courts, it is true, such as some easing of the right to travel, less emphasis on loyalty oaths, greater interest in trying to control police practices whether used against groups in demonstrations or against the individual who finds himself in trouble. On the positive side has been marked growth of free expression and less apparent censorship.

"On the negative side, the powerful growth of well-heeled right-wing groups, the revived strength of the House Un-American Activities Committee, the traveling witch-hunting that continues under the McCarran Act, the use of the Kennedy-Landrum-Griffin Act as an anti-labor political weapon, the Hoffa and Archie Brown cases, the use of snooping, spying and so-called 'lie-detectors,' and the general invasion of privacy that marks these times spells continuous danger for labor and liberal causes."

Some Gains: The oldest organization in its field, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), in its 44th annual report (1963-64) noted that there were "significant gains for civil liberties, especially in judicial decisions affecting the right to travel, state loyalty oaths, right to counsel in state court proceedings, compulsory self-incrimination in state actions, and state legislative apportionment. We can also be encouraged by the attention which events have this year focused on two civil liberties issues of importance. (1) The tragic events of Nov. 1963 in Dallas set in motion a number of studies of the problems of prejudicial publicity preceding the trial of persons accused of crime. Major attention was given to this publicity by the Report of the Warren Commission on the Presidential Assassination. . . . New attention is being given the problem in litigation and in the opinion of courts. The opportunity for basic institutional improvements has been considerably enhanced. (2) The many clashes between civil rights demonstrators and police have sub-

stantially increased the public attention being given police practices generally and especially to the ACLU-sponsored innovation of an independent, citizens police review board. Despite the renewed interest in this reform, intense resistance to it on the part of most law enforcement officers has kept remote the prospects that additional communities would adopt it. In fact the intensity of hostile reaction has often kept community debate from coming to grips with relevant considerations for and against adoption. Renewed attention to the reform—and to the underlying problem of how individuals are to be given an effective remedy for abuses of police authority—may nevertheless represent a net gain."

UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

A widespread movement to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities has developed in recent years. More than 30 national organizations and several distinguished citizens are on record in favor of abolishing HUAC.

In a 36-page pamphlet, *The Case Against the House Un-American Activities Committee*, the American Civil Liberties Union points out that the committee has been "1. Attacking education and educators so persistently that discussion of controversial issues was curbed. 2. Assaulting individuals and groups which, motivated by religious or ethical concerns, are active in various social movements. 3. Establishing files on individuals which have been used to attack the civil rights movement and its leaders by attempting to link civil rights activity with subversion and Communism."

The ACLU and many other organizations and individuals call for HUAC's abolition or drastic curbs on it. Although the Committee is not as active as it was in earlier years, it can still do much harm in the field of civil liberties. In the Buffalo, N.Y., area, for example, in May 1964, 6 of the 15 witnesses called before a HUAC subcommittee lost their jobs as a result. The ACLU had requested due process protection for those called to appear but HUAC ignored the request.

HUAC proceeded to investigate what it called "Communist infiltration" of the State University at Buffalo. One teacher at the university was dismissed and several others were denied promotion and higher paid teaching assignments.

Similar actions were carried out by HUAC in Minneapolis, Minn., where 2 of the 11 witnesses called before it lost their jobs. Names of witnesses were leaked to the press before the hearings opened. The Minnesota ACLU commented on the HUAC hearings: "They unfairly deprive individuals of their rights and foster a climate of suspicion, fear and misunderstanding, without serving any substantial legislative purpose."

Bulwark of Segregation: In her excellent study, *House Un-*

American Activities Committee: Bulwark of Segregation, Anne Braden points out that "Congress can abolish this committee at any time it wants to," and the National Committee to Abolish HUAC is coordinating efforts to persuade it to do so.

One of the most insidious methods used by HUAC in its attacks on civil rights is to label all organizations and efforts for integration as "Communist" or "Communist-inspired."

Analyzing many examples of such charges against civil rights groups, Anne Braden traces them back and finds in each case the same common fountainhead: either the House Un-American Committee or its counterpart in the U.S. Senate, the Internal Security Subcommittee (SISS) headed by James O. Eastland (D., Miss.) or one of several state committees modeled after them.

When the property of the Highlander Folk School at Monteagle, Tenn. was confiscated and its main building burned to the ground, it was revealed that the source of the false charges against the school as "Communist" were files of the HUAC and state committees.

The State of Alabama reported in 1964 that it had photographed every white person who attended the funeral of the young Negro girls killed in the bombing of a Negro church in Birmingham in Sept. 1963. As part of its detective work it had added to its record "101 files on reports from the Un-American committee."

HUAC and its fellow redbaiters thus, as Anne Braden notes, "have enabled the segregationist to tie his kite to the national issue of communism and thus pose, not as a defender of a corrupt Southern status quo, but as a guardian of the national security."

Opposed by Constitutional Authorities: By Dec. 6, 1964, one hundred constitutional law authorities had petitioned the House to abolish HUAC. They charged that the committee's existence "is irreconcilable with a system of free expression in this country." These professors, law school deans and lay authorities declared that HUAC's activities had hindered new ideas and new approaches to problems "which face us in a rapidly changing world."

The National Committee to Abolish HUAC pointed out that "no precise meaning has been, or can be, given to such terms as 'Un-American' or 'subversive'." Leaders in this committee include Prof. Thomas I. Emerson of Yale University, the late Dr. Alexander Meiklejohn, winner of the Presidential Medal of Freedom, and Prof. Henry Steele Commager of Columbia University and Amherst College.

Supreme Court Decision: The U.S. Supreme Court on June 17, 1963, threw out a contempt-of-Congress conviction initiated by the Un-American committee against Edward Yellin of the University of Illinois. In its 5-4 decision, the high court noted that HUAC had violated one of its own rules in not allowing Yellin to be questioned in executive session, before an open session, as he had requested. In refusing

to answer HUAC's questions in 1958 Yellin had claimed his rights under the First Amendment to the Constitution. He had been convicted of contempt in a Federal district court in Indiana in 1960 and sentenced to one year in jail and a fine of \$250.

Other Activities: HUAC introduced into Congress a measure signed into law by President Johnson in 1964 giving the Secretary of Defense power to dismiss employes of the National Security Agency. The law did not provide for any hearing or any right to know the charges, or the right of appeal.

HUAC's main activity in 1963-64 consisted of efforts to harass students and others who had gone to Cuba to study conditions there and who expressed pro-Castro sentiments on their return.

Peace Leaders Held in Contempt: Two leaders of Women Strike for Peace, Dagmar Wilson and Donna Allen, and Russ Nixon, general manager of the *National Guardian*, were held in contempt of Congress for refusing to testify in 1964 in secret hearings of HUAC.

They were convicted April 8, 1965, by a Federal judge. They were charged with refusing to answer questions about their help in obtaining an entry visa from the State Department for Prof. Kaoru Yasui, Dean of the Law faculty of Tokyo's Hoshia University, for a U.S. lecture tour. They had told HUAC that they would gladly testify in a public hearing.

They were later given suspended sentences of 4 to 12 months in jail and fined \$10 each. They immediately appealed the conviction. As the case raises the constitutionality of HUAC and its right to force witnesses to testify at secret hearings, it may be taken if necessary to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Congressional Opposition: Although protests against the committee and its operations have been growing over the years congressional action in the same direction has been slower.

Rep. William F. Ryan and Rep. Leonard Farbstein, New York Democrats, have been leaders in the abolition movement and have introduced bills to end the committee, as have Benjamin S. Rosenthal (D., N.Y.), Joseph Y. Resnick (D., N.Y.) and John V. Lindsay (R., N.Y.). Farbstein protested against "the use of the committee's files and resources to harass courageous persons fighting for integration who are also only asserting their constitutional rights of assembly and speech." Rep. Ryan, in attacking the extravagant appropriations for this committee, pointed out that it maintained a 61-member staff, the third largest in the House, although in its 26-year history it had been responsible for only 3 laws.

When the 89th Congress opened in 1965 an effort was made to get a vote on a House rules change to terminate the existence of HUAC as a standing committee. But the House leadership refused to permit this amendment of the rules. Then Don Edwards (D., Calif.) introduced a resolution to the same effect providing for the termination of the com-

mittee and transfer of part of its jurisdiction to the House Judiciary Committee. Rep. Ryan put in the record an editorial of the *N.Y. Times* (Jan. 4, 1965) which stated that the committee was "unnecded, untrustworthy and basically unconstitutional. The new House could not make a better start than by getting rid of it."

Despite the largest show of opposition ever made against it, a record appropriation of \$370,000 was voted on Feb. 25, the fourth highest voted for any House committee. On a key vote to delay the appropriation until public hearings could be held on it, 64 Congressmen supported the move. Although the motion was lost, the heavy opposition was regarded as major progress in efforts to curb and eventually to abolish the committee.

DENVER SMITH ACT CASE

The U.S. Department of Justice finally admitted on Nov. 12, 1964, that it had no case against 6 persons sentenced in 1964 in Denver, Colo., under the Alien Registration Act, known as the Smith Act. Their conviction on charges of "conspiring to advocate overthrow of the government" had been twice reversed by the U.S. Court of Appeals. After 10 years of harassment, the 6 were vindicated.

The defendants were Arthur Bary of San Jose, Calif., his wife Anna Bary of Denver, Joseph Scherrer and his wife, Maia, both of New York; Harold Zeppelin of Chicago, and Mrs. Patricia Blau of New York.

Sentences finally dismissed had included prison terms of two to five years and fines of \$1,500 to \$5,000. The defendants had been free on bonds ranging from \$5,000 to \$20,000 each. (See *Labor Fact Book*, 13 and 14.)

Lawyers for the defense, assigned by the Denver court, were joined by Attorney Mary Kaufman and later by Attorney John Abt of New York.

McCARRAN ACT REPRESSION

As reported in *Labor Fact Book* 16 the Communist Party was convicted in Dec. 1962 for failing to register as required under the Internal Security Act, known as the McCarran Act. But the conviction was voided Dec. 17, 1963, by the U.S. Court of Appeals which held that the government had failed to prove there was anyone available to register the Party without incriminating himself and getting indicted under the Smith Act. U.S. Supreme Court in a 5 to 4 decision on June 8, 1964, refused to review the Court of Appeals reversal. (See articles by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn in *Political Affairs*, Feb. and July, 1964.)

However, the Court of Appeals in its ruling in 1963 had opened the

way for a new trial and a possible conviction should the government be able to prove that there is some individual willing to register the organization.

The Department of Justice on Dec. 14, 1964, in the District Court, Washington, D.C., moved for this second trial. And on Feb. 25, 1965, it brought a second indictment charging the Party with failing to register for 11 days in Feb. 1965, and alleging there were volunteers available to register it.

On March 5, 1965, the government went into court and asked to consolidate the trial of the two cases. This was granted, and despite defense attorney's request for immediate and speedy trial, it was postponed till October.

Membership Registration Cases: By mid-1965 there were in all 43 membership registration cases under the McCarran Act in various parts of the country. The Supreme Court had agreed to hear arguments on a test case for the 43.

Hearings before the Subversive Activities Control Board were held Dec. 10 and 11, 1964, in the Boston cases, involving Otis Hood, Lewis M. Johnson, Ann Burlak Timpson and Edward Teixeira. At these hearings 2 spies admitted they had joined the CP and sent reports to the FBI. They were paid some \$32,000 for their espionage activity.

In New York, where the SACB held hearings Dec. 14 and 15, 1964, in the case of Hyman Lumer, editor of *Political Affairs*, the witnesses also were paid FBI informers.

In an earlier case Gus Hall and Benjamin J. Davis, Communist Party leaders, had been indicted in March 1962, but Davis died Aug. 22, 1964, while still under indictment. Hall's trial was postponed pending outcome of the Party case.

Hearings on the membership case against 2 New York leaders in the Advance youth organization, Marvin Markman and Mike Stein, were held for 4 days in March 1964. Appearing against them were 2 spies, one of whom was charged with perjury by defense attorney Mary Kaufman. He had attributed the same documents to Stein which he had earlier attributed to another defendant in another case.

Harassment: A statement by J. Walter Yeagley, Assistant Attorney General of the Department of Justice, indicated that the purpose of long drawn out prosecutions under the McCarran Act was to harass the Communist Party. He said that the Act "may prove unenforceable" but "our objectives are to keep the Party off balance . . . through harassment." (*N.Y. Times Magazine*, Oct. 25, 1964.)

In an editorial (June 11, 1964) the *N.Y. Times* said "it is time to give up this futile, degrading persecution" under the McCarran Act.

Further Protests: Petitions to support a bill to repeal the McCarran Act have been sent to President Johnson by the Citizens Committee for

Constitutional Liberties. It reported that the 2,000 signers, from 25 states, were "Americans who feel deeply that the McCarran Internal Security Act undermines constitutional guarantees and should be repealed."

Arval A. Morris, professor of criminal and constitutional law at the University of Washington, in an article on the Act (*The Nation*, March 22, 1965), says: "The issue is not the Communist Party. It is rather that groups advocating civil rights for Negroes, peace, rent control, a re-evaluation of our policy in Vietnam, disarmament and trade with China—if anyone on whatever grounds, suspects they just might be connected with Communists—can be subjected to governmental harassment. . . .

"The impact of the McCarran Act extends far beyond the Communist Party. . . . Surely the time has come to remember that freedom is indivisible and the McCarran Act its enemy."

RIGHT TO TRAVEL

The U.S. Supreme Court by a vote of 6 to 3 on June 22, 1964, struck down as unconstitutional the section of the McCarran Act that had denied passports to members of the Communist Party and its affiliates.

This decision of the high court was the first to hold that Congress had violated the Constitution in restraining Americans' freedom to travel. The case had been brought by Herbert Aptheker, then editor of *Political Affairs*, and by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, then chairman of the Communist Party, who died Sept. 5, 1964. Both leaders had been denied passports after the Party was ordered to register under the Act. The passport restriction prevented them from travelling outside the Western Hemisphere.

Justice Black in his concurring opinion in the case stated again, as he had in 1961, that the entire Internal Security Act of 1950 was unconstitutional. He termed the Act, including the travel restriction, a bill of attainder and an infringement on free speech.

In his concurring opinion on the right to travel Justice Douglas stated in part: "This freedom of movement is the very essence of our free society, setting us apart. Like the right of assembly and the right of association, it often makes all other rights meaningful—knowing, studying, arguing, exploring, conversing, observing and even thinking."

Current Restrictions: The State Department has imposed a ban and refuses to validate passports for travel to proscribed countries, including Cuba and China.

Helen Travis of Los Angeles was found guilty May 14, 1964, of leaving the U.S. without a valid passport by travelling to Cuba. On June 22, 1964, she was given a suspended sentence of 6 months and fined \$1,000 by a federal judge. This is now being appealed as a test case on

the right to travel. Attorneys A. L. Wirin and John T. McTernan of the American Civil Liberties Union are challenging the constitutionality of the State Department's ban on "unauthorized" travel to some, but not all, of the countries with which the U.S. does not have diplomatic relations. They maintain that the ban violates the implicit 1st Amendment right to obtain information and that no explicit legislative authority exists to limit travel on a geographical basis.

In the earlier passport case of William Worthy, foreign correspondent for the Baltimore *Afro-American*, involving his trip to Cuba without a passport (see *Labor Fact Book* 16), his conviction was reversed Feb. 20, 1964, by the Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans.

In June 1964 a group of American college students went to Cuba on a trip organized by the Student Committee for Travel to Cuba. Most of them went by way of Prague, Czechoslovakia. They contended that the U.S. government has no right to prohibit or interfere with travel of U.S. citizens to Cuba.

On their return 4 of them were subpoenaed by the House Un-American Activities Committee engaged in its customary smears of progressive activities.

Three students who had gone to Cuba the previous year with a group of 60 were indicted for defying the State Department's ban. Their case was argued in the Federal District Court in Brooklyn June 8, 1964. And in September a federal grand jury in Brooklyn indicted 9 persons on charges of conspiracy to organize and promote the trip of 84 students to Cuba in 1964 in violation of State Department regulations.

On May 3, 1965, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled 6 to 3 that the Secretary of State may refuse to grant passports to U.S. citizens for travel to Cuba. Louis Zemel of Middlefield, Conn., had applied for a tourist passport to visit Cuba. It had been denied and he had sued for permission to go. The court thus upheld the Secretary's authority to designate areas in which citizens may not travel unless given permission by the State Department. Justices Black, Douglas and Goldberg dissented. They conceded Congress had power to restrict travel but argued that restrictions were not proper in this case.

Editors of 13 college newspapers in April 1965 were refused permission to send student journalists to Cuba during Easter vacation. The State Department held they were not "full-time writers and journalists."

ARCHIE BROWN TEST

Under Section 504 of the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, known as the Landrum-Griffin Act, a member of the Communist Party is barred from holding office in a trade union. This law was cited in the case of Archie Brown who was indicted on a

charge that he had served as member of the executive board, Local 10 (San Francisco) of the International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union while a member of the Communist Party.

Brown had been a member of the board from Oct. 1959 to May 1961. He had been sentenced on May 4, 1962, to 6 months in prison. The U.S. Supreme Court in Nov. 1964 agreed to rule on the constitutionality of Section 504. Earlier in 1964, the U.S. Court of Appeals in San Francisco voted to set aside Brown's conviction, saying the law violated the 1st and 5th amendments to the Constitution and was a restraint upon freedom of association as well as a denial of due process.

In June 1965 the U.S. Supreme Court rejected the government's appeal against the lower court's decision in favor of Brown, and thus knocked out the anti-Communist provision of the Act. Justice Earl Warren who wrote the decision said the law as applied against Brown "plainly constitutes a bill of attainder." Gus Hall, leading spokesman for the CP, said the decision "goes a long way to restoring the basic democratic right of the members of unions to elect their own leaders."

MORTON SOBELL

By mid-1965 Morton Sobell had served 15 years in prison on a 30-year sentence for "conspiring to commit espionage." He had been convicted on a plea of not guilty in the 1951 trial with Julius and Ethel Rosenberg. In June 1962 the Federal Parole Board turned down his first appeal for parole and repeated the denial in 1963 and 1964.

Petitions asking for a citizen's full pardon, distributed by the Committee to Secure Justice for Morton Sobell, have been signed by hundreds of eminent Americans including Nobel prize winners Harold C. Urey and Linus Pauling. In foreign countries similar petitions have been signed by many distinguished leaders including Lord Bertrand Russell in England, Jean-Paul Sartre in France, Dr. Martin Buber in Israel, 11 members of Parliament in Switzerland, 6 members of Parliament in Italy, and trade union officials in England and Australia.

In 1964 Sobell announced that he wants appeals in his behalf to be based not on "clemency" but on a demand for "a full pardon based on my innocence and nothing else." (See *Invitation to an Inquest: A New Look at the Rosenberg-Sobell Case*, by W. and M. Schneir. Doubleday & Co., 1965.)

PROTECTING THE FOREIGN BORN

The U.S. Court of Appeals on Dec. 17, 1963, decided 2 to 1 that the American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born, under the Internal Security Act, must register as a "Communist Front" organiza-

tion. On April 26, 1965, however, the U.S. Supreme Court by 5 to 3 sent the case back to the Subversive Activities Control Board, stating that the evidence was "stale." (A similar ruling was made in the case of the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade.)

From its beginning in 1933, the American Committee has worked to promote and protect the interests of the foreign born in the U.S., regardless of race, color, nationality, creed or place of birth. It has opposed the deportation of resident aliens and the denaturalization of naturalized citizens. Thus it defended, for example, Claudia Jones, Katherine Hyndman and Peter Harisiades in their deportation cases.

Walter-McCarran Act: The Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952 (Walter-McCarran Act) still governs who may be admitted to the U.S. and still discriminates on the basis of race, color, creed and nationality. The Americans for Democratic Action says this Act was "founded on suspicion" and "treats both immigrant and citizen unjustly." ADA urges that the national origins quota system be abandoned; that second-class status of naturalized citizens "must be brought to an end," and that "grounds for denaturalization must be limited." It also urges the adoption of a short statute of limitations on the bringing of denaturalization and deportation proceedings.

Louise Pettibone Smith, Acting Chairman of the ACPFB, in a letter to its sponsors, March 4, 1965, says, "Today the paramount objectives of all groups committed to the defense of the foreign born should be to change at once by legislative amendment the most oppressive provisions of the Walter-McCarran Act and eventually to repeal the Act in its entirety."

In a special message to Congress (Jan 13, 1965) President Johnson again called for the elimination of the national origins quota system as "incompatible with our basic American tradition." There were hopes in 1965 that needed changes in the immigration laws would finally be passed.

Deportation Cases: Political beliefs and association are still used as grounds for deporting noncitizens irrespective of the number of years they have been in the U.S. For example, Joseph Sherman has been a resident of the U.S. for 44 years. He came here in 1920 at the age of 14; he worked in the clothing industry, and was a local officer of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers. The government charged that he had fought in Spain in the 1930's, to help the Spanish people against the fascist General Franco, and that he had re-entered the U.S. without proper inspection. He is fighting against deportation on charges dating back more than 20 years. On Jan. 7, 1965, the Board of Immigration Appeals refused to withdraw the deportation order against him. He has appealed his case to the U.S. Court of Appeals in New York City, which heard oral argument of his case on June 9, 1965.

Maurice Paul, long a trade union member in this country, won his 35-year fight against deportation when the Board of Immigration Appeals decided on Dec. 27, 1964, that the deportation order against him be withdrawn. His attorney, Blanche Freedman, argued that the government had not established the kind of meaningful membership in the Communist Party that was required under the Supreme Court decision in the Gestellum case. The government had used a paid government informer, B. J. Fikes, in its effort to deport Paul.

A long-time editor of the Lithuanian daily newspaper, *Laisve* (Liberty), Anthony Bimba, was naturalized as an American citizen in 1927. He is author of *History of the American Working Class* (in English). Now 70 years old, after 38 years as a citizen he is faced with cancellation of his naturalization because he is said to have concealed, when naturalized, certain "material facts" about himself. He did not state that he had once been charged in Massachusetts with "blasphemy" and "inciting overthrow of government." But these charges had subsequently been dropped by the State prosecutor as without foundation. Bimba's case in 1965 was awaiting trial in Federal District Court in Brooklyn.

Shortly after Bimba had appeared before the House Un-American Activities Committee in 1957, Rep. Gordon Scherer of Ohio charged that some foreign language press articles written during the Korean war represented "treason." He demanded the deportation of "active Communist editors" and included Bimba on a list of such editors.

MAIL CURB LIFTED

The U.S. Supreme Court on May 24, 1965, by unanimous decision held unconstitutional a federal law of 1962 which required persons to whom unsealed non-first class mail from 26 foreign countries is addressed, to make a special request to the Post Office to deliver it.

Under the law Customs Bureau agents decided if the publication was "Communist political propaganda." If so the Post Office notified the persons to whom it was addressed asking them to return an attached reply card if they desired the particular item, usually one issue of a magazine. If no reply was received within 20 days the mail was destroyed.

Postmasters in various parts of the U.S. had been handing over lists obtained through this statute to the House Un-American Activities Committee for use in further harassment of the persons involved.

The U.S. Court held that the law was contrary to the First Amendment's guarantee of freedom of speech and press.

The ruling grew in part out of a case brought by Dr. Corliss Lamont who challenged the statute after the Post Office Department held up

a copy of the *Peking Review*. Lamont declared after the decision that, "It is the first time in our history that the Supreme Court has knocked out a Congressional statute on the grounds that it violates the First Amendment guaranteeing freedom of speech." The Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, of which Dr. Lamont is chairman, hailed the ruling stating that, "Now, presumably, all those who have been harassed by requests for written permission to deliver mail addressed to them will get the mail reasonably promptly."

FREE SPEECH ON CAMPUS

Students at the University of California in Berkeley were involved in 1964 in one of the most significant struggles for free speech in the academic world. Many of them had been active in civil rights and other political struggles.

Administration of the university decreed in Sept. 1964 that students could no longer advocate off-campus political and social action, for example, on civil rights, on university property. In response the various political organizations of students insisted that they be allowed full political freedom. They set up tables in front of the Administration building and elsewhere on the campus. As a result, the Administration retaliated by suspending 8 leaders. This led to further student demonstrations and sit-downs and the formation of the Free Speech Movement. It contended that the University may take no disciplinary action against any student or organization for advocacy. The movement carried on a continuous struggle in the following weeks. On Nov. 20, 1964, the Board of Regents, made up largely of California businessmen, declared it would decide the legality of the advocacy and the right to take action at any time against any student or organization.

Later the Administration threatened to discipline 4 students who had led earlier campus demonstrations. This led to the all-night sit-in of Dec. 2-3 in Sproul Hall when the police arrested 775. Of the total, 155 were tried as representatives of some 600 who pleaded not guilty of a series of misdemeanors.

The students were held guilty of trespassing and resisting arrest. In July 1965 they were given jail sentences as high as 120 days and fines as high as \$220. Many refused probation whose conditions barred participation in group protests such as sit-ins. Most of them were out on bail pending appeal.

In May 1965 the Free Speech Movement issued a Declaration of Independence and a Students' Bill of Rights and announced the formation of the Free Student Union to take the place of the disbanding FSM. By May 1 more than 2,000 students had joined the new organization.

The two moves were in response to a report on regulating student conduct issued by a committee appointed by the Board of Regents. This Meyer Committee report was rejected by the student movement. On May 11 a special committee headed by J. C. Byrne, a Beverly Hills attorney, set up to study the problems of student rights, blasted the Administration and urged the setting up of a "broadly based" student government on all the University of California campuses. It recommended that such organizations should have full freedom to take public positions on all issues both outside and within the university.

STATE "SUBVERSIVE" ACT UPSET

The U.S. Supreme Court on April 26, 1965, declared unconstitutional key provisions of the so-called Subversive Activities Control Act of Louisiana. The decision held that the state authorities had been using the law to harass the Southern Conference Educational Fund, a civil rights organization active throughout the South.

The Court also directed the U.S. District Court at New Orleans to issue an order to restrain state prosecution of the fund's officials. The ruling would prevent Louisiana officials from trying James A. Dombrowski, executive director of SCEF; Benjamin E. Smith, its treasurer, and Bruce Waltzer, Smith's law partner, for not registering as members of the National Lawyers Guild. The 3 were arrested in Oct. 1963, after their homes and offices were raided by police and officials of the Louisiana Un-American Activities Committee.

Justice William J. Brennan, Jr. wrote the opinion of the Court, holding that the "chilling effect" on freedom of expression by prosecutions under the state law justified intervention of federal courts. This is a far-reaching extension of the power of U.S. courts to stop prosecution in state courts where First Amendment rights are involved.

The opinion held that the Act's definition of a "subversive organization" was too broad, and that one of its sections accepted the U.S. Attorney General's so-called "subversive list" as conclusive proof that organizations were "Communist front" groups without giving them a hearing.

VI. U.S. TRADE UNIONS

There has been no new government survey of U.S. trade unions since the one issued in May 1964 by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor. (*Directory of National and International Labor Unions in the United States*, 1963. Bulletin No. 1395.) It covers the situation as of 1962 and shows that membership of 181 national and international unions with headquarters in the U.S. then totaled 17.6 million. But slightly more than a million of these members are in Canada, so the trade union membership in the U.S. is well under 17 million.

In terms of union affiliation 14.8 million members, including those in Canada, were in the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations. About 2.8 million were in unaffiliated unions such as the Brotherhood of Teamsters, America's largest union, and United Mine Workers. At that time about 84% of the membership was claimed by unions in the AFL-CIO.

In 1956 the membership of unions (exclusive of Canadian membership) amounted to 33.4% of the employees in nonagricultural establishments. But by 1962 it had fallen to 29.7%, and is now estimated at around 27%.

AFL-CIO CONVENTION

The fifth biennial convention of the AFL-CIO met in New York City, Nov. 14-20, 1963, attended by 970 delegates representing 127 national unions, 6 departments, 45 state bodies, 212 city and county bodies and 29 directly affiliated local unions. Only about a dozen of the delegates were Negroes.

(For official report on the convention see the two-volume *Proceedings* available from AFL-CIO.)

Automation and Unemployment: These two issues were emphasized as the major problem facing the country. The inability of collective bargaining to deal with these problems and their effects, and thus the need for federal action was stressed.

Pres. George Meany in his opening address referred to the threat

of automation. He said: "There is no longer any question in my mind . . . as to the direction in which automation is going today.

"There is no element of blessing in it. It is rapidly becoming a real curse to this society. When you study what's happening, you realize that this is a real threat. This could bring us to a national catastrophe. Every big corporation in America is in a mad race to produce more and more with less and less labor without any feeling as to what it may mean to the whole national economy." This was happening, said Meany, under "the greatest system of government ever devised by the minds of men."

The seven-point AFL-CIO program on automation, as summarized by *Monthly Labor Review* of the U.S. Dept. of Labor (Jan. 1964), called for (1) appointment of a Presidential Commission on Automation; (2) establishment of a technological clearing house to gather information about impending changes and their impact on jobs, on the location of industry, training needs, etc.; (3) measures for economic growth including an immediate and sizable tax cut, a major increase in public spending, and an appropriate monetary policy; (4) improvements in the unemployment compensation program; (5) greater efforts to match workers with jobs through a more effective employment service, expanded retraining programs, etc. (6) higher wages and other benefits; (7) establishment of a Federal information and guidance service to assist unions and employers in developing solutions to the problems created by technological change.

Kennedy Calls Jobs Top Issue: In one of the last speeches of his life U.S. President John F. Kennedy, Nov. 15, pleaded for aid from labor to help achieve a tax cut to avoid a recession. He said "the whole economic climate" in a year of "record prosperity" was affected by the 4 million persons out of work and by a rate of joblessness "as high today as it was in 1954," a year of recession.

He said that "Productivity goes up so fast and so many millions come into the labor market, that unless we have the most extraordinary economic progress in the history of our country we cannot possibly make a dent in the 5.5% figure" of unemployment.

Although stressing the importance of the civil rights issue, he pointed out that, "No one gains from a fair employment practice bill if there is no employment to be had; no one gains by being admitted to a lunch counter if he has no money to spend; no one gains from attending a better school if he doesn't have a job after graduation; no one thinks much of the right to own a good home and to sleep in a good hotel or go to the theater if he has no work and no money."

The nation must improve its education, he said. But "what concerns me almost more than anything else is the statistic that there will be eight million young boys and girls coming into the labor market

in the '60s who have not graduated from high school. . . . The best schools, the best teachers, the best books—all these are of no avail if there are no jobs."

Economic Program: A 15-point economic program was adopted closely related to the automation resolution. It called for a national planning agency; expansionary monetary policies; increased federal spending for public works; enactment of the Administration's tax cut bill with amendments to concentrate its benefits among low and moderate-income taxpayers; enactment of a youth employment opportunities program; "a faster pace of increase in wages and fringe benefits"; an increase in the federal minimum wage to \$2 an hour and expansion of coverage by about 16 million persons; a cut in the standard working hours, with a 35-hour week as the goal; additional federal standards to raise the level of benefits to underemployed workers; a national manpower policy "to assist working people and communities to adjust to the disruptions of rapidly changing technology"; appointment of an automation commission and an all-out war on the "shameful persistence of poverty."

Civil Rights Action: A dominant issue at the convention was civil rights. *Monthly Labor Review* noted that the emphasis "shifted from concern with discriminatory practices within the Federation, which was stressed in previous conventions, to the wider scope of the issue in the community and the country at large and to the role of trade unions in the civil rights movement."

The resolution on civil rights urged enactment of legislation in Congress as well as in state and local governments. It also urged the elimination of discrimination in housing, hospitals and other health care units built with federal funds, loans, guarantees or insurance.

It was reported that a special task force of 5 leading union officials had been set up in the summer of 1963 "to assist AFL-CIO local central bodies to initiate the establishment of biracial human rights committees, or civil rights committees, in the major cities" where none exists and to strengthen them where they do.

Supporting the resolution, Vice President A. Philip Randolph emphasized two other proposals—the establishment of a representative committee of Negro trade unionists and officers of AFL-CIO to plan programs and evolve new techniques to deal with discriminatory practices at the local level. He urged also the appointment of a committee of the AFL-CIO leadership to meet periodically with the leaders of the six national civil rights organizations to work out mutually beneficial policies. He hoped that top officers of AFL-CIO would go into areas of racial tension and "speak to the rank and file in the moral and economic terms they can understand."

One delegate moved to commit the convention to Randolph's pro-

posals. But Pres. Meany opposed this and they were merely referred to the executive council for "consideration."

Randolph in his speech warned his fellow labor leaders that "there is a growing feeling of alienation from the labor movement in the Negro community," due in part to "persistence of racial discrimination in a number of unions" and also "because of the failure of labor to throw its full weight into the civil rights revolution."

Right-wing Threat: "The growing threat of the right wing" was stressed in the report of the executive council to the convention. Long before the nomination of Barry Goldwater by the Republicans the following July, the report said: "For the first time [in the U.S.] the rightists have learned to use the political process effectively to advance their cause."

"They have insinuated themselves into positions of influence in the Republican party structure at the local and state levels. They have many adherents in Congress, open and covert. At the state level rightists have scored alarming successes."

The report referred to the fact that more than 1,000 rightist groups are now active with a claimed membership of 4 million and financing that "can be traced back to big business and big industry."

The resolution on political action also referred to the forces of Right-wing ultraconservatism that have "turned to political action as an outlet for energies and spites."

The political resolution also named as anti-liberal groups the American Medical Association and the National Association of Manufacturers. The latter has "fathered the business-industry political action committee (BIPAC) in behalf of reactionary candidates."

Foreign Policy: The convention continued to reflect U.S. State Department and Pentagon foreign policy positions. In its resolutions on foreign policy it expressed concern over the "disarray" in the Western Alliance. It noted that Allied disunity had manifested itself in disagreement over the strategy of NATO, friction over trade between the U.S. and Europe, withdrawal of the French fleet from NATO control, divergent views on the war in Vietnam, contradictory trade policies with Communist nations and differences over UN policies.

It said, "We fervently hope that our government will spare no effort to resolve the present disputes among the allies and to build an ever more effective and powerful western community." It expressed reluctant approval of the limited test ban treaty which it said, however, had failed to relax tensions in the cold war.

It backed the U.S. stand on Cuba, on West Berlin and foreign military aid without even mentioning the savings on defense expenditures suggested by many U.S. Senators. It hailed the Alliance for

Progress program in Latin America and urged support of various strike-breaking operations as, for example, in British Guiana.

In its report to the convention the executive council attacked the coexistence policies of the Soviet Union, while gloating over the "deeply scarred" condition of the "myth of monolithic Communist unity."

Organization and the Labor Board: The executive council's report to the convention called for all-out effort to change the laws and procedures which permit employers to intervene harmfully in representation elections for collective bargaining.

It pointed out that the U.S. labor force has an unorganized potential of 29 million. It reported that in 7,355 representation elections held under the National Labor Relations Act the unions had won 59% in the fiscal year 1962 compared with 56% the previous year.

It called the present National Labor Relations Board "moderate" and "impartial" compared with the anti-labor Board that had functioned under the Eisenhower Administration.

INDUSTRIAL UNION DEPARTMENT CONVENTION

The 300 delegates at the Fifth Convention of the Industrial Union Dept. of the AFL-CIO in Washington, D.C. (Nov. 7-8, 1963), represented about 6 million workers included in 59 unions. In his report to the convention Pres. Walter P. Reuther called the nuclear test ban treaty a "small but significant step toward arms control."

Test Ban and Disarmament: The convention formally hailed the test ban treaty as "the most dramatic and constructive move toward world peace in this generation." It called for the nation to intensify its efforts toward disarmament, and denied that such disarmament would produce social and economic dislocations "provided plans are made in advance to apply the resources saved by a reduction in arms expenditure to the needs of the nation and the world community."

It declared that huge markets could be created in the U.S. by channeling some of the savings from defense cuts to low and middle income families through proper taxation. It said that disarmament would present a unique opportunity to provide housing, roads, hospitals, health care and the like.

It called for an expanding program of research, development and planning under the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Program for Full Employment: A program for full employment for America in the sixties was outlined in one of the key convention resolutions. It urged the establishment of a "technological information clearing house" to assist management, labor and government "in making more intelligent decisions about the impact of technical and scientific change."

It stated that wage increases in the U.S. "have lagged behind the sharply rising productivity of the economy; the result has been to weaken even more the general level of consumer purchasing power."

It supported massive expansion of public works programs "to cut into the enormous backlog of needed public improvements." It urged modernization of social security programs and specially called for a modern system of unemployment compensation with federal standards.

Civil Rights and Other Action: An important mark of progress at this convention was the evidence of closer relationship of the organization not only to the peace movement but to the civil rights revolution. In speeches and resolutions it expressed pride for the part the IUD had played in mobilizing a big labor turnout for the Aug. 28 (1963) Washington March for Jobs and Freedom. It criticized the AFL-CIO executive council majority for refusing to endorse this historic civil rights march.

Other resolutions called for reduction in worktime by a cut in hours with no loss in pay; for renewal of organizing work among migratory workers and for legislation protecting their rights and setting minimum welfare conditions; for congressional reform to end filibusters and the obstructive control of congressional committees by Southern reactionaries.

WOMEN IN U.S. UNIONS

About 3,272,000 women were members of trade unions in the U.S. in 1962, it was estimated by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (*Monthly Labor Review*, May 1964). Although this showed a decline of about 33,000 since 1960, women still made up about 1 out of 6 of all union members.

The proportion of women workers who are in trade unions is now about 1 out of 8 as against 1 out of 7 in 1960. For men in the labor force the proportion now in unions is estimated as about 1 out of 4, a slight decline also in the 2-year period.

Of all women members in trade unions some 560,000 or about 17% were reported members of 2 unions in the apparel industry—Amalgamated Clothing Workers and International Ladies Garment Workers. Other unions reporting a sizable woman membership were Electrical Workers (IBEW), Hotel & Restaurant Employees, Retail Clerks, Automobile Workers, and Communications Workers.

In 22 unions women are in a majority and these unions account for two-fifths of all women union members. About 89% of women trade union members were in AFL-CIO unions, while 11% were in unaffiliated unions.

In Work and Struggles: As in many earlier labor struggles,

women workers have been active participants in trade union work and strike picket lines in recent years. In Atlanta, Ga., in Dec. 1964 some 700 workers, most of them Negro women, were on strike at the plant of Scripto, Inc. and calling for a world-wide boycott of the company's goods. Scripto, a large manufacturer of pens, pencils and lighters, with plants in other countries, refused to recognize the International Chemical Workers Union (AFL-CIO), local 754, as bargaining agent for the workers. It advertised for white scabs to work with the white employees who remained on the job.

After 7 weeks the strike was settled with wage increases and other benefits. It had the active support of leading civil rights organizations. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. spoke to the striking women and joined their picket line.

In the nationwide strike of auto workers at General Motors plants in Sept.-Nov. 1964 about 60,000 were women workers who picketed and actively supported the 6-week struggle. The central issue was how GM treats its workers, about one-fourth of them women.

Strikes of teachers, social workers, retail clerks and other white-collar workers also involved large numbers of women participants. For example, the Utah public school teachers on strike in May 1964 were mostly women, as were the social workers on strike in New York City in March 1964.

Retail, Wholesale & Department Store Union (AFL-CIO) has enrolled many women workers in recent years. For example, it organized 160 nonprofessional hospital workers at the Baptist Memorial Hospital in Gadsden, Ala., in the fall of 1964. Some of the women workers who were on strike for 6 weeks before winning recognition and increased wages were making as little as 58 cents an hour working as many as 30 days without a day off, and receiving no overtime pay. Union members include practical nurses, laboratory technicians and dietary workers.

Women were also picket line leaders when the same union had a drive to line up 18,000 hospital workers in the voluntary hospitals and nursing homes of New Jersey in the fall of 1964. A 14-hour strike victory was won at St. Barnabas Hospital, Newark, on Sept. 15.

In Union Posts: Union offices are often held by women members. For example, United Packinghouse Workers of America, in a survey of its locals in 1964 found that in 282 locals that answered its query there were 24 women presidents, 38 vice presidents, 102 recording secretaries, 74 financial secretaries, 11 secretary-treasurers, 198 executive board members and 95 trustees. About 74,000 members are in this union, of whom over 15,500 are women, or over 20%.

Rose Russell: An outstanding leader of the New York Teachers Union, Mrs. Rose Russell, died Jan. 2, 1965, at the age of 65. For

17 years before becoming head of the union she was a leader not only in the union but in the broader field of education, having worked all her life for teachers' rights, for better schools and for civil liberties.

Mrs. Russell led the successful fight against the Feinberg law which had made legal the witch-hunt in New York City schools. She defended the rights of teachers in red-baiting hearings and political investigations. She led the successful struggle against a New York City Board of Education resolution making refusal to become an informer ground for dismissal of a teacher. Already in the 1940's she had campaigned for school integration, sought the appointment and advancement of Negro teachers and had spoken out against slum schools in Harlem.

As president of the union she worked steadily for better salaries for teachers, for improved school conditions and protection of the interests of unemployed and substitute teachers.

FACTORY WORKER AGREEMENTS

More than 60% of the production and related workers in the manufacturing industries of the U.S. were employed by plants in which a majority were covered by collective bargaining agreements. The proportion ranged from 83% in transportation equipment (mainly autos) to only 27% in the textile mill products group. By region the lowest percentage was in the South (41%); the highest in the North Central states including the Detroit and Chicago areas (71%).

Describing the study from which these conclusions were drawn, Arnold Strasser in the U.S. Labor Department's *Monthly Labor Review* (Feb. 1965) says, "The proportion of union workers appears to have declined from about 67% of total factory employment in 1958 to 62% in 1962. Due to changes in the industrial classification system, the data for the two survey periods are not, however, strictly comparable, and the actual decline may have differed somewhat.

Changes in membership in unions whose membership is primarily drawn from the manufacturing industries threw further light on the bargaining situation. Among the 17 unions that had at least 100,000 members (including nonproduction workers) 7 had greater and 10 had less membership in 1962 than in 1958. And the aggregate membership of these unions was 3% lower in 1962 than in 1958.

1963 UNION CONTRACT PROVISIONS

Approximately 3.6 million workers out of 7.1 million covered by major union contracts (those affecting 1,000 or more workers) gained improved benefits through negotiations in 1963, the U.S. Bureau of

Labor Statistics reported. Some were won through strikes, mentioned elsewhere in this chapter, others through the threat of strike.

The average wage increase achieved in these new contracts in 1963 was 3.4% or about 7 to 8 cents an hour for the 2.7 million workers who gained wage increases. The remaining 900,000 workers, mainly in the basic steel, aluminum and related high-wage industries, although having no changes in wages, gained substantially liberalized supplementary benefits of various kinds.

Nearly a fifth of the 2.7 million workers who won wage increases in 1963 received increases of 5% or more.

In reviewing the figures for 1963 the *American Federationist* (Feb. 1964) reported that major negotiations in 1963 were conducted in the telephone industry resulting in contracts that increased wages by 3 to 4% and liberalized pension and insurance plans.

"In the electrical manufacturing industry, 2 to 3% wage increases were won, as well as improved vacations, insurance, holiday pay, improved pensions and increased layoff benefits."

In the construction industry the "increases during 1963 showed wage boosts generally of 4 to 5% or more. The most typical wage increase in construction was 20 cents an hour."

"In addition, most of the major settlements changed one or more fringe benefits as well as providing for wage increases."

MAJOR CONTRACT GAINS, 1964

Approximately 3 million union workers out of 3.8 million covered by new major union agreements negotiated during 1964 received wage increases. The average increase in these union agreements, each covering 1,000 or more workers, was 3.3%, or about 9 to 10 cents an hour. Nearly a sixth of the workers who won wage increases under such contracts during the year received 5% or more.

Many additional workers under major agreements, mainly in the automobile industry, gained substantial fringe benefits instead of new wage increases in 1964.

Some of the 1964 increases are covered in the reports of strikes conducted by unions during the year. Others were won without strike action after lengthy negotiation.

These increases were the result of contracts negotiated during the year and not those made effective automatically as the result of contracts signed in previous years, for example, those resulting from fixed annual or deferred increases under long-term contracts or those resulting from the rise in the cost of living under escalator adjustments.

In addition to those in manufacturing and some non-manufacturing industries substantial gains were won in the construction industries

where most of the increases were at least 10 cents or more an hour. Construction increases were about 3.5% and generally about 15 to 20 cents an hour. As the *American Federationist* noted (Feb. 1965), "The higher cents-per-hour settlements are a reflection of higher base rates, seasonal work and related conditions in that industry."

The pension improvements in the automobile industry are referred to elsewhere. There were similar improvements in the rubber, oil, longshore and other contract settlements in 1964 which achieved a reduction in retirement age requirements and improved pensions. In meatpacking the pensions were increased to \$3.25 from \$2.50 per month per year of credited service while full vesting rights were established for workers with 15 years of service at the age of 40 or over. In rubber the pension benefit also was increased to \$3.25 with full pension benefits payable at age 62 to employees with 10 or more years of service.

Additional paid holidays were obtained in many of the union agreements as well as longer vacations. Some unions negotiated 5-week vacations and the length of service required for 3- and 4-week vacations was reduced.

The *American Federationist* reported also that, "Many contracts improved insurance protection. Health, medical and surgical insurance also was improved in a number of contracts, with more and more companies paying the full cost."

DEFERRED INCREASES DUE IN 1965

At the beginning of 1965 it was estimated by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics that about 3.7 million workers would obtain wage increases under major union contracts negotiated in past years. This was reported to be 1.3 million more than the number that got deferred wage hikes in 1964.

Of the 3.7 million workers affected, 1.7 million are in manufacturing industries, some 600,000 in construction and 1.4 million in other industries.

The typical increase due manufacturing workers under these major union agreements averages about 7 to 8 cents an hour. In non-manufacturing the deferred increases are generally about 9 to 10 cents; and in construction they range from approximately 15 to 25 cents an hour.

In addition to automatic, deferred wage increases, cost-of-living escalator clauses were to bring increases to approximately 2 million workers during 1965. This is on the assumption that the consumer price index rises during the year. It has been going up by about 1.5% in recent years. If it continues at the same rate, those that are

to receive increases under escalator clauses would get upward wage adjustments of 3 to 4 cents an hour.

TEACHERS BARGAIN COLLECTIVELY

Writing in *The Nation* (Feb. 1, 1965) Myron Lieberman, author of *The Future of Public Education*, noted that teachers have never been regarded as militant unionists and that they have usually tended to avoid what they regard as "union" tactics. Bureau of Labor Statistics found that there were only 91 strikes by public school teachers from 1940 to 1962 and these caused a loss of only 251,660 man-days.

Lieberman says: "In the light of the record, the widespread outbreak of teacher strikes and threatened strikes during the past year, and especially since the November 1964 election, suggests that new factors have come into play. In Kentucky, New Jersey, Georgia and Oklahoma . . . strikes actually occurred. In Pawtucket, R.I., a 6-day strike took place in October 1964 and a second one was narrowly averted in November. In East St. Louis, 4-day strikes were called in September and again in October. In Louisiana school boards granted teachers time off to petition the legislature. In Utah, a statewide boycott of the public schools appears to have been averted by the election victories of legislators favorably inclined toward substantial improvements in teacher welfare."

Right to Organize: Although there is considerable opposition in some states to teachers unions there is no serious legal question as to the right of teachers to organize. Lieberman notes that "unless the employees' right to form organizations is accompanied by the employers' obligation to recognize and negotiate with them, employees find it difficult to improve their conditions through collective action." And at present Wisconsin is the only state in which the school boards "must bargain in good faith" as distinguished from consulting or conferring.

Michael H. Moskow finds that, "In states where collective bargaining in public education is not prohibited, two rival teachers' organizations have made strong efforts to persuade school boards to conduct representation elections and to negotiate with the designated teacher organizations. The organizations currently engaged in increasingly bitter competition are the American Federation of Teachers, affiliated with AFL-CIO, and the National Education Ass'n, an independent professional association," with a membership of over 900,000. Moskow's paper on "Collective Bargaining for Public School Teachers" was excerpted in *Monthly Labor Review* (Nov. 1964).

Agreements and Elections: The AFT, he writes, "makes no effort to distinguish its approach to the teacher-board relations from traditional bargaining." Although this union "claims to have approximately 12 written agreements between school boards and teachers' unions, only 4 in-

clude terms and conditions of employment; the others are merely recognition agreements." Also, several of their agreements "do not provide for exclusive recognition, and in 2 cases the school boards have signed written agreements with the NEA local as well as the AFT local."

The AFT has won elections mainly in the big cities while the much larger NEA associations have been strongest in the smaller places. It was reported by AFT (in its official organ, *American Teacher*, Sept. 1964) that its locals had won 11 "pioneering bargaining elections" in recent years to represent 62,502 teachers while the NEA "company unions," as AFT calls them, "have also won 11 but with teachers totaling only 7,881." Of course, the New York City victory in 1961 covered about 70% of the AFT total. The largest group won by the NEA was in Milwaukee, representing 4,242.

In an interview on Nov. 22, 1964, the new President of the AFT, Charles Cogen, said there were approximately 1.5 million teachers in the U.S. (others put the figure as high as 1.8 million) of which over 100,000 were organized in the AFT in June 1964. That was a gain of over 18,000 in the last year. (By March 1965 the AFT membership had reached 140,000.)

Cogen charged that the NEA is "administration-controlled" and does not have the interests of the teachers primarily at heart. He said that the AFT stressed grievances against school administrations.

AFT Gains: This union won recognition in New York City through a collective bargaining election in 1961, and thereafter in Detroit, Cleveland, Chicago, Philadelphia and several other cities. Reviewing the results of the New York City election he said that since the collective bargaining recognition there, "the teacher has gained a feeling of self-esteem, self-worth, self-respect; a feeling of independence that's worth more than anything else that he could have attained."

Cogen said the aim of the union was to obtain for teachers a salary range of from \$6,000 to \$14,000 a year, compared with the present national average of about \$6,000 while the minimum in many places is a little over \$3,000.

The AFT has been active in civil rights work. Its members have participated in remedial courses for Negro students affected by school closing in Virginia. It has strongly supported civil rights legislation and some of its members participated in the 1964 Mississippi summer project.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Government workers' unions are not permitted to strike or to bargain on wages, hours or other provisions set by law. But they can bargain on working conditions and grievance procedures. Very few of them are organized except in the postal service.

A total of 205 collective bargaining agreements covering nearly 25% of the 2.5 million employees of the federal government has been negotiated since 1962 when an executive order was signed by President Kennedy encouraging such contracts. It gave sole collective bargaining rights to any union chosen by a majority in the unit involved.

A survey by the U.S. Department of Labor found that of the 593,000 persons covered by such contracts late in 1964 about 470,000 were in pacts negotiated between the Post Office Department and 6 unions.

Outside the postal service the largest union for government workers is the American Federation of Government Employees (AFL-CIO) which covers only 55,000 persons in 108 contracts. Its total membership, including those not covered by collective bargaining contracts, is over 106,000 organized in 917 local unions.

At its March meeting in 1965 the AFL-CIO executive council noted a "substantial increase" in union membership among federal employees. It expressed support for legislative and collective bargaining programs "to help federal workers keep pace with the social and economic progress of the nation."

It called for matching for federal employees of salary advances in the nongovernment sector of the economy, improved civil service retirement benefits and a higher federal contribution to the health benefits and life insurance programs of federal employees.

U.S. STRIKES OF 1963-1964

During 1963: The number of strikes in the U.S. totaled 3,362, the second lowest level in the postwar years. Strike idleness, counted as 16 million man-days of work lost, represented only a fraction of 1% of the estimated total worktime of nonagricultural workers, the lowest level since 1944. Average number of workers involved in 1963 strikes was 280 compared with 340 in 1962 and 431 in 1961. Major issues in these strikes, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reported, were general wages changes (39.3% of stoppages); plant administration (16.3%); union organization and security (15.8%); and interunion or intraunion matters (11.3%).

Only 7 strikes in 1963 each involved 10,000 or more workers. Some 29,000 members of the Lumber & Sawmill Workers and International Woodworkers on strike from June 6 to Aug. 18 in California, Oregon, Washington and Montana won wage increases of 30.5¢ an hour in 3-year contracts. About 20,000 construction workers in St. Louis area on strike during the summer gained wage increases under a 3-year contract.

About 60,000 dock workers of International Longshoremen's Ass'n on a 34-day strike at East and Gulf ports during January and February won wage increases of 24¢ an hour over a 2-year period and 13¢ an hour in

fringe benefits. About 3,500 members of the Transport Workers Union on Philadelphia buses, trolleys and subways on strike for 19 days in January gained a 20¢ hourly increase over 2 years and 13¢ an hour in increased benefits.

Approximately 20,000 newspapermen in 10 unions in New York City area out for 114 days ending March 31 gained a wage packet valued at \$12.63 a week, a cut in hours of work and simultaneous expiration of agreements for all 10 unions. In Cleveland 2,500 newspapermen out for 129 days ending April 5 won a 26-month contract with package increase valued at \$13.65. This included weekly payrise of \$2.50, increased hospitalization and retirement benefits and 4 weeks paid vacation after 20 years service.

Some 10,000 members of Packinghouse Workers on strike at Swift plants in 6 states in February and at Armour plants in October gained improved job standards on work loads.

Some 1,000 steel workers at Dow Chemical plants in Illinois on strike for 82 days during September–November, gained a package wage increase of 17¢ an hour in a 21-month contract.

Nearly 2,000 rubber workers at Firestone and U.S. Rubber Co. plants on strike for 6 months beginning June 18, gained a new two-year contract providing a 16¢ hourly wage boost.

About 8,000 textile workers in dyeing and finishing shops in New York City and New Jersey after a 9-day strike starting Sept. 30 won a 3-year contract with immediate increases of 12¢ an hour and further increases in 1964–65.

At 9 big hotels in Philadelphia about 2,000 on strike Oct. 1 won a new contract providing wage increases and fringe benefits. Workers in New York area on strike in October against layoffs and speedup at Ward Baking Co. accepted a compromise settlement.

Some 4,500 atomic trades workers at Oak Ridge, Tenn., after a 28-day strike ending Nov. 11 won a new 18-month contract with a 3% wage increase and 25¢ an hour in premium pay for Sunday work. Over 7,000 Communications Workers in California on strike Oct. 20 gained wage increases and improved fringe benefits.

Printers on 2 Florida newspapers went on strike in November against introduction of a computer for automatic typesetting and the consequent layoffs of workers.

About 2,000 of the Automobile Workers at General Motors, Chrysler and Ford plants were on strike through October and November against speedup, company demands for more output and cuts in manpower; also demanded better protection in health and safety measures. Strike ended Dec. 9 with a compromise.

Some 11,000 workers at Food Fair stores in eastern states on strike in November won an agreement on wages to be paid new employees in

discount stores. About 3,000 of Electrical Workers (IBEW) in Chicago area out in November in a dispute over bonus rates, accepted a compromise.

In December some 2,000 waiters on strike in 95 restaurants in New York City gained a 3-year contract with pay raises of \$2 a week in both second and third years.

About 1,300 machinists in Chicago on strike for 11 days from Nov. 1 gained a contract with an average increase of 19¢ an hour over three years and a company-supported health insurance plan.

1964 Strikes: Number involved in strikes and man-days affected in 1964 were at the highest level since 1959. Although strike activity was substantially above 1963 the level was still low in comparison with earlier years. There were about 3,600 strikes involving 1.6 million workers and 23.3 million man-days of work. Strikes cost a higher percentage of total working time in 1964 than in any of the preceding four years.

There were 18 major strikes which began in 1964 each involving 10,000 workers or more, compared with the postwar low of 7 such strikes starting in 1963.

Nearly one-third of the man-days involved in 1964 strikes resulted from major conflicts in the automobile industry. The largest was called by Automobile Workers against General Motors. The union struck Sept. 25 and at its peak involved more than 250,000 workers at 126 plants. Tentative 3-year national agreement was reached 10 days later but local issues held up final settlement. Company resumed partial work Oct. 26 with all strikers back by Nov. 9.

GM workers gained improved fringe benefits in relation to pensions, vacations and relief time equivalent to a 4-5% increase in yearly earnings. They had especially sought relief from excessive and arbitrary overtime work and protection against unhealthful plant conditions. The cash wage raise under UAW's former 3-year contract with GM was deferred until 1966.

Other 1964 Strikes: Those involving large numbers were as follows:

Automobile workers against Caterpillar Tractor in Illinois, beginning in January. Some 8,000 soft coal miners of United Mine Workers in Pennsylvania, Ohio and West Virginia were out in March and April, striking for paid holidays, longer vacations and vacation pay equal to regular pay. More than 10,000 railroad workers, represented by 4 operating unions, struck Illinois Central for 2 days in April.

More than 10,000 public school teachers represented by Utah Education Ass'n were on strike May 18-19 for more state aid to education. A 4-day strike of public school teachers started May 18 in East St. Louis. led by American Federation of Teachers. It resulted in a union agreement and pay increases.

Some 10,000 Railroad Trainmen in mid-western states were on strike for 2 days in June. Operating engineers in the construction industry in Ohio struck in July for 1 day.

Longshoremen of ILA (AFL-CIO) struck in East and Gulf ports Oct. 1 but were immediately halted by Taft-Hartley injunction. Automobile Workers struck American Motors at Kenosha and Milwaukee, Wis., for 4 days in October. This union also conducted a 6-day strike in October against Caterpillar Tractor in Illinois, Iowa and Pennsylvania.

Communications Workers struck New York Telephone Co. in New York State for 8 days in November. Automobile Workers against Ford Motor on interstate basis, were out 17 days beginning Nov. 8. Strikes involving about 80,000 of company's 130,000 hourly employees were authorized at a number of Ford plants that had not signed local agreements by early November. Settlement cost the company from 4.7% to 5% more than the 1961 contract. Terms of 1964 settlement were similar to those in GM contract.

Other Conflicts: Some 1,800 members of rail unions on strike against Florida East Coast Ry. for more than a year were still out at end of 1964. Over 2,000 members of Mine Workers struck Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates mines in West Virginia; also some 3,400 were out in Western Pennsylvania, Ohio and West Virginia. Miners at U.S. Steel mines in Pennsylvania were on strike for 10 days in April winning improved benefits.

Some 5,200 bus workers struck Public Service Coordinated Transport Service in New Jersey for 16 days ending March 24, winning wage increases of 8¢ an hour; 10¢ an hour for 1965 and a 3-cent cost of living allowance.

About 1,000 unionized social workers in New York City were out for 22 days ending March 11. They won agreement with Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, providing wage increases over a 2-year period and improvements in hospital and retirement benefits.

More than 1,200 ILA longshoremen on New York City west side docks were out for 2 days in July over seniority hiring practices of Waterfront Commission. Some 1,700 Auto Workers at General Motors plants in Detroit were out March 17 to April 9 in disputes over work standards.

About 2,500 of the Auto Workers struck May 12 at Deere & Co. farm machinery plant at Des Moines, Iowa. This strike was not authorized by union, but expressed workers' grievances over safety conditions and piece-work rates. Some 2,500 Railroad Trainmen, out for 8 days against Los Angeles Metropolitan Transit Authority signed a three-year contract June 22 providing for wage increases. In all, some 8,000 trainmen were on strike during June on 7 southwestern and midwestern rail lines against rules changes involving job assignments.

About 5,000 Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers, on strike for 5 weeks beginning July 9, against Kennecott Copper in Colorado and 3 other states, won 3-year contract with wage increases and other benefits. About 2,200 of the Aluminum Workers struck for a month May 23 at Massena, N.Y., plant of Aluminum Co. of America. Reached agreement on work loads.

A strike that had shut down the *Detroit News* and *Detroit Free Press* in mid-July was settled on Nov. 21. This was said to be the longest strike on major metropolitan papers in U.S. history.

Efforts to organize new groups of workers or to obtain new contracts were often successful only after strikes that in some cases, especially in the South, met with police violence.

For example, in the strike against Planters Peanut Co., division of Standard Brands, in one of its branches at Suffolk, Va., in May 1964, the police and state troops used clubs and dogs to drive strikers away from the plant's railroad siding. Some union members were hit by cops or bitten by dogs. Four of them were hospitalized.

As a result of this strike the 1,600 members of the union, a local of the Retail, Wholesale & Department Store Union, won their chief demand, a \$1.50 hourly minimum for the lowest category. This meant a 17-cent an hour wage increase for 900 Negro women workers over two years while the other plant employees won 16 cents, 8 cents each year for two years. The workers also won improvements in the arbitration procedure and other benefits.

A feature of this strike was the large number of women involved and the solidarity of the 1,300 Negro and 300 white workers.

UNION PENSION PLANS

Some findings of a government study of union and related pension plans were summarized in the *Monthly Labor Review* of the U.S. Department of Labor, July 1964, by Walter W. Kolodrubetz of the Division of Industrial and Labor Relations. He pointed out that a private pension plan, as defined in the government study, is a plan "established unilaterally by an employer or a union, or jointly by both, that provides a cash income for life to qualified workers upon retirement."

The plans included in the study covered anywhere from 26 to approximately 370,000 workers. And the number of persons currently drawing benefits from the plans ranged from none to over 10,000 per plan and totaled about 1.2 million.

Of the total of 15,818 plans included in the study, with some 15,621,000 workers covered, there were 5,795 plans covering 10,695,000 workers that were mentioned in collective bargaining agreements and therefore could be called union pension plans. Of these union plans 4,285 were in the manufacturing industries. In fact 70% of the workers covered in

manufacturing by both union and nonunion plans were included in plans mentioned in collective bargaining agreements.

In 3 out of 4 of all the plans, union and nonunion combined, the employers financed the entire cost of retirement benefits. A fourth of the plans, covering about one-fourth of the workers, were contributory plans, financed by joint employer-employee contributions. In a small number (110) of the union-sponsored and operated plans, covering about 250,000, the workers alone financed the plans.

Noncontributory plans in which the workers did not pay were common in manufacturing industries such as apparel, printing and publishing, and in the highly unionized metal working industries.

Some Specific Plans: Pension provisions vary according to the strength of the union, the character of the industry and many other factors. United Automobile Workers in their new agreement with automobile companies, in 1964 won the right for its members to retire as early as age 60, or even at 55 under certain conditions. A worker retiring at age 62 to 65 will get \$4.25 a month in basic pension for every year of credited service. A 30-year man retiring at 65 will collect \$127.50 a month in addition to his social security.

In the United Steelworkers plan, the average pension is about \$90 a month. In addition, under the steel industry pension agreement, a worker gets full pay for the first 3 months of retirement, plus a cash bonus equal to 13 weeks or more if he has not previously taken the extended vacation provided under the 1963 steel contract. (Changes in the steel workers' pensions were expected in the 1965 negotiations.)

In anthracite coal mining, pensions have been cut from \$100 a month to \$30. A slump in the industry reduced the amount of royalties paid in the United Mine Workers pension fund.

New York locals of the Textile Workers Union in 1964 persuaded the companies in its bargaining area to finance a multi-employer pension plan to give union members retirement benefits. The National Maritime Union which established a pension program in 1954 reported that its pensioners averaged \$125 a month in 1964 rising to about \$150 a month in 1965. The International Longshoremen's Association pension plan in 1965 was providing \$100 a month in pension benefits.

Another recent development in union pension funds was the merging of the 41 local funds of the International Ladies Garment Workers, with combined assets of \$217 million. Previously these had been separate funds. The \$50 per person per month benefit in some local funds of the union was recently raised to \$60 a month while those locals paying \$60 are raising their payments to \$65.

Studebaker Losses: When the Studebaker Corp. suddenly shut down its automobile plant at South Bend, Ind., early in 1964 some 7,000 men and women were thrown out of work. The company claimed there

was only enough money in the pension fund to provide pensions for workers over 60 years of age. Pensions for Studebaker workers had depended on their age and years of service. Although the pension fund totaled \$24 million when the plant closed, the union contract provided that the money in the fund should go first to those already retired and then to those eligible for retirement. Those of age 60 and over received paid-up annuities. But the fund was almost exhausted by the payments so that thousands of others, some of them entitled to vested pensions, lost all their pension rights along with their jobs.

"RIGHT-TO-WORK" REPEALER

Organized labor's No. 1 objective in the 89th Congress was to obtain the repeal of Section 14 (b) of the Taft-Hartley Act (National Labor Relations Act) which permits the separate states to pass so-called "right-to-work" laws which ban union shop agreements.

The laws now in force in 19 states are part of the right-wing, big business union-busting attack on the labor movement. Repeal of Section 14 (b) would nullify these state laws.

Sen. Barry Goldwater, an advocate of the state laws, in Jan. 1963 introduced a bill to impose "right-to-work" on every state except those which enact specific legislation permitting union security clauses in labor-management contracts. No action was taken on the measure.

The Democratic Party in its 1964 platform pledged repeal of section 14 (b) and President Johnson in his State of the Union message in 1965 called for it. Repeal would merely restore to the federal government its jurisdiction over such matters.

State Action: Some progress was made in the last 2 years in repealing the state laws, and in rejecting efforts to pass new ones. In 1964 Oklahoma voters rejected a right-to-work proposal. In 1965 the New Mexico legislature rejected one by a decisive majority. In Indiana in Feb. 1965 the legislature repealed the law it had passed when the Republicans were in power in that state in 1957. The new Governor, Roger D. Branigin, a Democrat, pledged the voters to sign a repeal if elected. He called the law a sham, and added: "It has accomplished no purpose which is worth the rancor and controversy it has stirred among our citizens."

Commenting on the action in Indiana, *Labor*, the railroad union organ (Feb. 6, 1965) said that "most people now know that the term 'right-to-work' is a misnomer. Such laws give no right to a job to anyone, nor do they create a single job. They merely prohibit workers and employers from freely negotiating agreements establishing a union shop, even though the vast majority of employees in a plant want such an arrangement. These laws wreck free collective bargaining, glorify 'free riders' who want all the benefits of unionism without helping to pay the cost,

and weaken the power of organized workers to win higher wages and better conditions."

Trade unions have pointed out also that the states that have these laws are usually those that have the lowest per capita incomes, wages, standards and employment conditions. Almost all the southern states are on the list.

In Feb. 1965 the John Birch Society *Bulletin* which goes only to members of the ultra-Right organization, urged its readers to offer their assistance to the National Right to Work Committee, a nationwide group urging open shop laws and especially the passage of more state right-to-work legislation. It is also leading the fight to oppose repeal of section 14 (b). The National Association of Manufacturers and other employer bodies are also working against repeal.

In a statement at its Feb. 1965 meeting the executive council of AFL-CIO declared: "Section 14 (b) is a unique anomaly in the whole body of federal legislation and affronts the basic concepts of the Constitution." It "flies in the face of the original constitutional declaration that on matters where the federal government has assumed jurisdiction, federal law should be superior to state law."

COLD WAR LINE

The foreign policy resolution at the last convention of AFL-CIO reflected the continuing cold-war line of AFL-CIO leadership even after the Administration had taken some steps toward easing tensions at least with Moscow. There has since been no appreciable change in the position of these leaders.

At its meeting in May 1964 the executive council said, "We dare not tire in the struggle to prevent a Communist takeover of the world." The council opposed even the extension of normal business relations with the Soviet Union stating that, "Expanded western trade and the extension of long-term credits to the Communist regimes will not help them 'evolve toward democracy' or remove the sources of world tension. On the contrary, such help by the U.S. and Western Europe might well help the Communist regimes to emerge from their present difficulties strengthened for the next round of offensive actions against the free world." (*AFL-CIO News*, May 23, 1964.)

The executive council, at its Miami meeting in Feb.-March 1965, opposed the proposed visit by President Johnson to the Soviet Union. And it again opposed any increase in trade with the USSR or other Communist countries. "Under no circumstances should any strategic goods be sold to any Communist government." And even though the Administration still bans trade with China and Cuba, the labor leaders are afraid the U.S. may sell something to some other Communist country that

might be resold to Cuba or China. They oppose such trade. And whatever trade there is, it suggests, should be used as a cold war weapon against the socialist nations.

The council endorsed the air attacks on the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and urged "energetic retaliatory measures" against the South Vietnam National Liberation Front. President George Meany warned that "the American people should not pressure the President into negotiations." He also backed the Johnson policies in the Dominican Republic intervention, as did President David Dubinsky of the Ladies Garment Workers.

Some Dissenters: A minority of labor officials took a view contrary to Meany's and Dubinsky's. At least 7 union officials, including one member of the executive council (A. Philip Randolph), joined with SANE and hundreds of teachers in colleges and universities in urging negotiations in Southeast Asia and warned that continuation of the air attacks on North Vietnam could lead to all-out war.

Among those who signed a SANE appeal in the *N.Y. Times*, Feb. 19, 1965, were Secretary-Treasurer Patrick E. Gorman of the Meat Cutters, Secretary Frank Rosenblum of the Clothing Workers, and President David Livingston of District 65, Retail, Wholesale & Department Store Union. It declared that "no issues will be decided by prolonging the bloody and fratricidal conflict in South Vietnam. . . . Now, before the war escalates into a major disaster, means must be found . . . to take the issue from the field of battle to the conference table."

The executive board of the AFL-CIO's largest union, the United Auto Workers, in April 1965 urged "political solutions that would bring an end to the Vietnamese conflict." Later, at a Detroit meeting, Secretary-Treasurer Emil Mazey of the same union attacked the Johnson policy in South Vietnam. He called for implementation of the 1954 Geneva agreement and a UN trusteeship agreement until free elections can be held.

A strong independent trade union voice for peace was expressed at the 16th biennial convention of the International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, with 308 delegates representing upward of 65,000 members. After listening to a powerful address by Senator Ernest Gruening of Alaska, stating frankly that the U.S. is the aggressor in Vietnam, the convention, April 9, 1965, passed a policy statement calling upon President Johnson and Congress "to stop the killing in Vietnam."

It said that the U.S. policy "now follows the incredible path of 'negotiation through escalation.' This terrifying concept is but one step removed from escalation to a world holocaust." It proposed: "1. Cease fire; 2. Withdrawal of all foreign troops; 3. Negotiate; 4. Settlement and peace."

VII. POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS

RECORD OF EIGHTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

The 88th Congress of the U.S. met for its first session on Jan. 9, 1963, and adjourned on Dec. 30. Its second session lasted from Jan. 7 to Oct. 3, 1964.

Although the first session accomplished much less than had been expected, the second session, under the leadership of President Johnson, passed most of the broad program originally outlined by the late President John F. Kennedy. It added some of the bills such as the poverty program proposed by Johnson who said after the close of the second session that it had "enacted more major legislation, met more national needs, disposed of more national issues than any other session of this century or the last."

Test Ban Treaty: Outstanding accomplishment of the first session was the ratification by the Senate of the treaty negotiated by the U.S., the Soviet Union and Great Britain banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere. Even the *AFL-CIO News* (Oct. 10, 1963), which had always maintained cold war positions, said that this action by Congress was "what many historians may some day consider its greatest achievement."

Although the test ban treaty was the leading achievement of the first session, the *Washington Newsletter* of the Friends Committee on National Legislation (Jan. 1964), said that "Congress continued almost automatically to allocate more than one-half the budget to military defense and such status symbols as landing a man on the moon."

Other significant legislative measures of the two sessions combined were as follows:

Civil Rights Act: The far-ranging civil rights proposals of President Kennedy, further strengthened in Congress, passed in the second session after 83 days of filibuster staged by Southerners in the Senate. It followed the first successful cloture vote against a civil rights filibuster in history.

The bill passed by 289 to 126 in the House and by 73 to 27 in the Senate and was signed by President Johnson July 2, 1964. It established a ban on discrimination in hotels, eating places and theaters serving the

public. It prohibited discrimination in employment, established stronger safeguards and more effective enforcement of the right of Negroes to register and vote; and gave new powers to the Attorney General to desegregate schools and public facilities. (See Chapt. IV.)

Tax Cut: The cut of approximately \$11.5 billion in individual and corporate income taxes over two years was signed into law Feb. 26, 1964. Pres. George Meany of the AFL-CIO said later that it "represented the nation's first approach to the use of federal tax policy as true economic stabilizer, and it has worked."

Although the bill did bring more take-home pay to the average worker, it did not attempt any thoroughgoing reform of the tax structure. The federal tax system remained choked with inequities, many of which were only aggravated by the tax reduction.

Economic Opportunity Act of 1964: This anti-poverty measure as passed by Congress only scratched the surface. The *N.Y. Times* editorially (Oct. 19, 1964) called it "too limited in means, too timid in ideas, even as a jumping-off point." (See Chapt. II.)

Housing: Action in this field was largely an extension of existing programs. Congress approved a \$1.1 billion 15-month extension of the low-rent public housing and other programs, including appropriations (only \$50 million) aimed at stimulating rehabilitation of slum properties. It also approved a program of low-rent housing for migratory workers.

Conservation Measures: Congress created a National Wilderness Preservation System out of federally held wilderness areas. It also set up a Land and Water Conservation Fund to provide for future state and federal recreation area needs.

Education: Late in 1963 it enacted a large-scale 3-year \$1.2 billion program of federal grants and loans to construct college classrooms and other academic facilities.

A new five-year \$731 million program of federal aid to vocational education was passed, with the emphasis shifted to the training of young people in skills needed now and in the future.

Manpower Training: The Manpower Development and Training Act was extended and additional money authorized to train workers displaced by automation or those wishing to upgrade skills. At the same time Congress established a National Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress to make studies and recommendations about the rapidly changing interrelationship of man and machine.

Equal Pay for Women: An 18-year campaign for a federal law providing equal pay for equal work regardless of sex, was won in this Congress. The law applies to employers subject to the wage-hour provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. (See Chapt. II.)

Farm Workers: A migrant crew registration bill was passed aimed at preventing such abuses as overcharging workers for transportation, abandoning a crew, failing to return workers to their homes and underpaying them.

Health Programs: A \$329 million 4-year program was passed to help build community mental health centers, and research and treatment centers for mental retardation and to help train teachers of mentally retarded and handicapped children.

Congress also extended the Hill-Burton Act program of federal construction grants for hospitals and nursing homes, for the first time allocating funds to modernize obsolete hospitals and other health facilities primarily in city areas.

It also voted funds for construction of teaching facilities for medical, dental and related health professional schools and for nursing school construction and loans to student nurses.

Mass Transit: The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 authorized \$375 million in federal grants to states and local communities over a 3-year period to help public and private transit companies expand and improve facilities and services.

Food Stamp Plan Extended: The pilot food stamp plan which had been established by President Kennedy in 43 local communities was made nationwide and permanent. Under it low-income families certified as eligible by State and local welfare agencies will use the money they normally spend for food to buy federal food coupons, redeemable for food at regular retail stores. The pilot program found that the program had been good for the people concerned as well as for the farmers and the neighborhood stores. It increased the consumption of fluid milk, fresh vegetables and fruits among the participants and improved the quality of their diets.

Food for Peace: Congress also extended and expanded the food-for-peace program to provide the needy abroad with a more adequate diet. Bill authorized \$3.5 billion in sales and grants of farm surpluses to combat famine, malnutrition and hunger in more than 100 less-developed countries.

In extending the program, however, Congress added certain restrictive amendments, one of which prohibits the Administration from selling surplus farm commodities to Poland and Yugoslavia for local currencies. This action led to strained relations with these countries.

Consumer Protection Bill Killed: The "truth-in-lending" bill introduced by Sen. Paul Douglas (D., Ill.), as Sidney Margolius, consumer writer, pointed out in the *United Mine Workers Journal* (Aug. 1, 1964), "was killed by one of the most powerful assemblages of business organizations that ever set out to beat a bill intended to protect the living standards of moderate-income families."

This bill to require full disclosure of true annual interest rates and finance charges on consumer credit charged by lenders and stores, was backed by trade unions, co-ops, credit unions and consumer organizations. But it was bitterly fought by "a massive array of business associations," including the National Retail Merchants Ass'n, the Chamber of Commerce of the U.S., the National Foundation for Consumer Credit, the National Finance Ass'n (finance companies) and even the American Bar Ass'n.

When the bill was killed by a close vote in the Senate Banking Committee, Sen. Douglas called it "a victory for the usurers and money lenders."

Labor Comment: AFL-CIO leaders considered this the best Congress since 1936. Andrew J. Biemiller, head of the AFL-CIO Department of Legislation, praised its passage of labor legislation, but stated also that passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 alone, "would mark this as a great Congress."

ELECTIONS OF 1964

Sen. Barry M. Goldwater was nominated for President of the United States by the Republican National Convention at San Francisco on July 15, 1964, the first ballot giving him 883 votes to 214 for Gov. William Scranton of Pennsylvania. Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York received 114 votes while a few went to other contestants. The following day Rep. William Miller, Republican National Chairman, was nominated for Vice President without dissent.

The way in which the Republican Party and its convention was captured by ultra-Right elements was described by Mike Newberry in his booklet *Goldwaterism*. He defined Goldwaterism as "native fascism, of the classic type seen in pre-war Europe." After studying the action of the Goldwaterites at the convention, he concluded that "The mass basis of Goldwaterism is racism at home, military adventurism abroad, and anticommunist hysteria everywhere."

Goldwater Extremism: The fanatical spirit that prevailed at the nominating convention was indicated also in an article in *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* (Jan. 1965) by Prof. Walter Johnson of the University of Chicago: "The Senator and his supporters demanded complete surrender by other Republicans to his position. The contempt with which the more moderate Republicans were met when they attempted to amend the civil rights and world affairs planks of the platform—and the booing of Governor Rockefeller; the nomination of Congressman William Miller; the way Goldwater hailed extremism in his acceptance speech; and the takeover of the Republican National Convention by true believers was part of a snarling mood that indicated there was no longer

any place in the high command of the party for those who were not Goldwater activists."

On Aug. 26 at Atlantic City, N.J., the Democratic National Convention by acclamation nominated Lyndon B. Johnson for President and Hubert H. Humphrey for Vice President.

Democratic Landslide: On Nov. 3 Johnson and Humphrey were elected by a landslide.

The total vote cast was 70,640,289, largest in American history and 62% of the eligible voters (those of voting age). It was well above the 68.8 million who voted in 1960. But it was below the nearly 72.7 million who would have voted if 63% of the eligibles had voted as in 1960.

The Johnson-Humphrey ticket received some 43.1 million votes or over 61% of the total popular vote; the Goldwater-Miller ticket about 27.2 million or 38.5% of the total. The winner's share was the largest of any popular vote ever received in a U.S. Presidential election.

Johnson was the first southern President since Andrew Johnson (1865-1869). He won 44 states and the District of Columbia which voted for a President for the first time. He was the first Democrat in history to win the Republican stronghold of Vermont and the first to carry New Hampshire since 1944 and Maine for the first time since 1912.

The electoral vote for Johnson was 486 against 52 for Goldwater. The latter carried only his own state of Arizona and five states in the deep South—Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama (where Johnson was not on the ballot), Georgia and South Carolina, all dominated by racial oligarchies determined to strangle the Negro civil rights movement. His biggest victory was in Mississippi where he won over 87% of the vote. This state had never gone Republican since 1872.

Senate and House Changes: In the U.S. Senate where a third of the seats were being contested in 1964 the Democrats emerged with 68 seats to the Republicans' 32, a net increase of 2 seats. Before the election, the line-up had been 66 to 34.

In the House of Representatives where all 435 seats were contested, the Democrats gained the largest margin since 1936. After the voting the number was 295 Democrats to 140 Republicans; before it had been 254 to 176 and 5 vacancies. For the first time since 1938 the White House seemed to have enough votes to defeat the coalition of Republicans and reactionary southern Democrats.

NEGROES AND WOMEN IN CONGRESS

There are no Negroes in the U.S. Senate. The election of John J. Conyers (Mich.) brought to 6 the number of Negroes in the House. The other five Negroes who were re-elected in 1964 were William L.

Dawson (Ill.); Charles C. Diggs, Jr. (Mich.); Augustus F. Hawkins (Calif.); Robert N. C. Nix (Pa.), and Adam C. Powell (N.Y.). All are Democrats.

Like the Negroes, women are not well represented in the 89th Congress. The number of women in the House was cut from 11 to 10 in 1964 with the defeat of one Republican woman, a reactionary from New York State, the retirement of one Democrat from West Virginia and the election of a new one from Hawaii, Patsy T. Mink (D.), the only woman of oriental ancestry in Congress. There are two women Senators—Maurine B. Neuberger (D., Oregon), widow of the late Senator Richard Neuberger, and Margaret Chase Smith (R., Me.).

NEGROES IN THE ELECTION

The huge turnout of some 6 million Negro voters was one of the features of the 1964 election, and about 90% voted for the Democrats. By states it ranged from 85% to 99% for Johnson. The vote in predominantly Negro wards in the North ranged from 18% to 30% above 1960 when it was considered to be the decisive factor in the Kennedy victory.

The so-called "white backlash" vote did not show up, as other issues were considered more important than resentment against Negroes, even in Indiana and other areas where primary elections had indicated some tendency in this direction.

On the strength of the Negro vote President Johnson carried 4 southern states—Arkansas, Tennessee, Virginia and Florida—which otherwise would have gone Republican, John Herbers reported in *N.Y. Times* (Nov. 22, 1964). And North Carolina might have been lost to the Republicans had it not been for the Negro vote.

Throughout the South, he noted, Negroes were almost 100% for Johnson because Goldwater had voted against the civil rights bill and advocated decentralization of the federal government "which they look to for protection of their civil rights."

Negro registration in the 11 southern states had increased only from a little over 1 million to about 1,475,400 in the ten-year period ended in 1962, but it shot up to a total of 2,164,000 by 1964. This increased registration was a big help to Johnson. He carried those states having the highest Negro registration and failed to carry those states that had less than 45% of the eligible Negroes registered—Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia and South Carolina.

In Mississippi, where less than 7% of the Negroes were registered, 87% of the total vote went to the Republicans. In Alabama 69% of the voters were for Goldwater over unpledged Democratic electors as John-

son was not on the ticket; the percentage of Negroes registered in that state was only about 23%.

Elected Negroes: As a result of the Johnson landslide it was estimated by the Democratic National Committee that the number of Negroes in elective office in the U.S. had increased between a quarter and a third. All but 10 of the 280 Negro holders of elective office after the election were reported to be Democrats. Negro candidates increased their seats in state legislatures from 57 to 90.

In addition to a new Congressman, a State Senator was elected in Georgia (Horace Ward) and one re-elected (Leroy Johnson). In Tennessee, A. W. Willis, Jr., the first Negro elected since Reconstruction, was sent to the legislature. In Texas, a second Negro joined the school board. In Oklahoma four Negroes were chosen for the legislature. A Negro was elected to the county board of revenue (Rev. V. A. Edwards) and to the county board of education (Charles G. Gomillion) as well as 2 justices-of-the-peace in Macon County, Ala., the home of Tuskegee Institute. Savannah, Ga., elected its first Negro councilman.

Kansas, Iowa and Delaware elected Negroes for the first time, Iowa sending two to the assembly, with Kansas and Delaware choosing Senators. Negroes won additional seats in the legislatures of California (where 3 more were elected to make 9, including one Senator), New York and Massachusetts. Incumbents were re-elected in Arizona, Ohio, Nebraska and Washington.

Others are mentioned in an article on "The Negro Vote Against Goldwater" by T. R. Bassett in *Political Affairs*, Jan. 1965. He writes:

"Other gains were a district judgeship in Colorado, and election of 2 Negroes, Edward R. Dudley, former Manhattan Borough President, and Darwin W. Telesford, a Civil Court Judge, to the New York State Supreme Court. In Illinois, Theodore A. Jones won election as a trustee of the University of Illinois by 1.8 million votes."

Attorney Willie Brown: An important victory in San Francisco was won by Willie Brown, Negro lawyer, who was elected to the state assembly with 31,509 votes over his Republican rival who got 21,981. Brown was backed by the labor unions and opposed by the leading newspaper and property owner groups.

His Republican opponent tried redbaiting but without success. Brown had been endorsed by a wide range of organizations including the W. E. B. DuBois Club of San Francisco. A memo by J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI called the national DuBois Clubs a tool of the Communist Party. But Brown refused to disavow the local group's endorsement. His post-election comment: "We defeated reaction, red-baiting and racism."

A Republican Winner: Edward W. Brooke, Republican Attorney

General of Massachusetts, was re-elected with a total vote of over 1.5 million, more than double that of his Democratic opponent, James Hennigan, whose campaign was tuned to "white backlash" votes. Brooke, on the other hand, rejected Goldwater, stating, "I found Mr. Goldwater's principles and mine incompatible." The only Negro ever elected to such a high office in the United States, Brooke told *U.S. News & World Report* (Feb. 1, 1965), "A Negro who openly supported Barry Goldwater would have been regarded as a traitor to the cause of civil rights."

NEWSPAPER ELECTION LINE-UP

One of the features of the 1964 election campaign was the support given to the Democratic ticket by the daily press. A survey by *Editor and Publisher* showed that of the daily newspapers of the U.S. (1,036 that answered a questionnaire) over 42% supported the Democrats and only about 35% supported the Goldwater ticket. The rest took what they called an "independent" position.

In circulation the Johnson lead was much greater. The 440 papers supporting him had a combined circulation of about 27 million while that of those supporting Goldwater was 8.9 million; the "independent" papers had a circulation of 7.63 million. (*N.Y. Times*, Oct. 30, 1964.)

This was the first time since Grover Cleveland that a Democratic Presidential candidate had a majority of the editorial pages on his side.

The entire Hearst chain, the Scripps-Howard chain, most of the Newhouse chain, the *N.Y. Herald Tribune*, the *Boston Herald*, *Kansas City Star* and other papers that previously supported only Republican candidates were lined up for the Johnson-Humphrey ticket.

STATE LEGISLATURES AND GOVERNORS

More than 500 seats in state legislatures switched from Republicans to Democrats in 1964. Only a handful went the other way, mostly in the South. Following the election the Democrats had control of 32 state legislatures or 6 more than before. The Republicans were in control of both houses in only 6 states and control was split in the others.

The changes in most states were due to the crippling effect of the Goldwater campaign on Republican legislative candidates.

In New York and Michigan, although the legislatures went Democratic for the first time in years, they were faced with Republican Governors.

Governors were elected in 1964 in 25 states. The Democrats won 2 and lost 3, winding up with 33 to the Republicans 17. Before the election the line-up was 34 to 16.

Gov. George Romney, a moderate Republican, was re-elected in Michigan with 56% of the vote in the face of a Democratic tide that gave Johnson 68% of the state's vote. In Rhode Island Gov. John H. Chafee was re-elected even though Johnson got 81% of the state's votes. In Washington state a moderate Republican, Daniel J. Evans, was elected although Johnson carried the state. And Montana re-elected its Republican Governor although the state went for Johnson and Democratic Senator Mike Mansfield.

LABOR'S POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

Organized labor was nearly 100% for the Johnson-Humphrey ticket. It found that Goldwater in his entire 12 years in the Senate had not once voted "right" in labor's view on any issue of importance.

It was labor's biggest effort in any political campaign. It supported here and there a Republican candidate for Congress or state legislature. In New York City, for example, the AFL-CIO backed 3 city Republicans for reelection to Congress: John V. Lindsay, Paul A. Fino and Seymour Halpern. There was also a split on the Senatorial race with some 50 AFL-CIO locals backing Republican Kenneth Keating while the majority went for Robert Kennedy who was endorsed by the Committee on Political Education, AFL-CIO (COPE). Most of the rail unions backed Keating as did the State Teamsters. The City Teamsters, however, supported Kennedy.

None for Goldwater: In previous elections a few national labor union leaders had backed the Republican presidential candidate. But in 1964 none supported Goldwater. The minority of Republicans on the AFL-CIO executive council came out for Johnson, for example, Pres. James Suffridge of the Retail Clerks, Pres. Maurice Hutcheson of the Carpenters and Pres. Lee Minton of the Glass Bottle Blowers.

Following the election Alexander Barkan, director of COPE, said, "this was our best campaign. We had and used more manpower. We had more unity among our people. We spent more money."

COPE reported that its local groups had endorsed a total of 403 candidates exclusive of the presidential contest; 273 of these won their races or nearly 68% of those endorsed.

In House contests, 349 candidates were endorsed and 233 won. In the Senate, 31 were endorsed; 25 won. In gubernatorial races, 23 endorsements were made; 15 won.

Pres. George Meany called the results "truly a victory by and for the American people. . . . We in the AFL-CIO are proud of the part our members played in this victory. The major emphasis of AFL-CIO's Committee on Political Education, year in and year out, is on our registration and get-out-the-vote campaigns." In a message to Johnson

he said, "The people have given their overwhelming mandate to the Great Society. That mandate can and must be fulfilled."

Labor Men in Congress: Following the elections, *Labor*, organ of the railroad unions, noted that out of 535 members of the House and Senate there were then 21 members of labor unions. Later it counted 30 present and former union members. But George Morris, veteran labor reporter of *The Worker*, pointed out that most of those listed were in no way actively related to the trade union movement. For example, Sen. Paul Douglas, who many years ago, before he entered politics, carried a card in the AFL Teachers Union. Others listed seem to be those who became members when working as printers or in some other field where union membership was not avoidable.

Actually there are not a half dozen trade union men in Congress of the type of the newly elected Paul J. Krebs, former president of the New Jersey CIO and now organizing director of the Auto Workers in that state. The unions have very little direct representation in Congress through their own members and, says Morris, are "not much better represented than the Negro people."

MINORITY VOTERS

All the minority parties and write-in votes for President in 1964 came to a total of only 332,660 or about 6-tenths of 1% of the total vote. These included both those on the Right and on the Left; the Communist Party and the Socialist Party were not on the ballot anywhere.

The Socialist Labor Party with its candidate on the ballot in 17 states, and with write-in campaigns conducted in 8 other states, had 44,674 of their votes counted. The Socialist Workers Party (Trotskyites), on the ballot in New York and a few other states, received 32,327.

Other minority groups included the racists who made up the Alabama Independent Democratic Electors with 210,732 votes, the Prohibition Party with 22,962, the Constitution Party with 5,060, the National States Rights Party, with 6,953, and scattered votes totaling 9,929.

Conservative Party of New York State: In New York State the right-wing Conservative Party, formed in 1962, was wholly for Goldwater, but opposed to Sen. Kenneth Keating because he deserted the Goldwater ticket in 1964. So it put up its own candidate for U.S. Senate, Dr. Henry Paolucci of Iona College in New Rochelle.

He received 212,216 votes or an increase of nearly 83% over the Conservative Party's Senatorial vote in 1962. It claimed that 31 members of the New York State legislature were elected with its endorsement. In a post-election statement Chairman J. D. Mahoney said the Party would continue its battle against the "renegade leadership of the New York Republican Party." He boasted that the "graph of growth

for the Conservative Party and the conservative movement in the past few years is vertically upward." He predicted that ultimately "the bell will toll for the liberalism which sits astride our nation at this hour."

RIGHT WING POST-ELECTION POSITION

Replying to those who concluded that the Radical Right had been smothered by the 1964 elections, Sen. Frank Church (D., Idaho) in a Senate speech Jan. 12, 1965, said he did not agree. He explained: "The propaganda network of the radical right forms a giant web. Its 20 largest publications boast a combined circulation in excess of a million. The right also makes its pitch on the public air through 7,000 separate radio broadcasts each week. The case history of one spokesman measures the menace: The Rev. Carl McIntire began his broadcasts in 1958 from a single radio station. He later accused the National Council of Churches—Methodists, Presbyterians and 29 other denominations—of being 'apostate, Communist, and modernist.' Today, the avalanche of contributions he solicits from gullible listeners underwrites daily broadcasts on 617 stations."

Sen. Church had an article in the Jan. 26, 1965, issue of *Look* magazine called "Conspiracy U.S.A." dealing with the same situation. Other Senators who contributed to the discussion, several citing the irrational attacks made on them during election campaigns, were Moss of Utah, Bartlett of Alaska, Young of Ohio and Tydings of Maryland. Senator Church cited the leader of the Minutemen, which claims to have 25,000 "patriots" in its secret army, as stating that "The hopes of millions of Americans that the Communist tide would be stopped with ballots instead of bullets have turned to dust." And the St. Petersburg, Fla., unit of the same organization responded with its own call to arms in the following language: "If you are ever going to buy a gun, buy it now. Form a secret Minutemen team."

This, said the Senator, is not only wild-eyed and fanatical but an "extreme symptom of the right-wing affliction which, if it keeps on spreading will inject millions more with the fever of fear."

Birch Society Flourishing: One of the most prosperous of the Right-wing organizations is still the John Birch Society which announced in Jan. 1965 that it had collected \$3.2 million in donations in 1964, about twice the amount it had received from members in 1963. President Robert Welch reported that the society had played a "very active" part in the California primary elections in 1964, that 100 members had attended the Republican National Convention as delegates and that their influence had been "strongly felt." He said that the weekly payroll of the organization had risen from \$15,000 early last year to \$30,000 in Jan. 1965. (*N.Y. Times*, Jan. 17, 1965.)

COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE USA

The Communist Party ran no candidates on its own ticket in 1964. A statement expressing the views of its leadership, issued after the election, said that it had "played an important and significant" role, that "it helped to bring greater clarity and a degree of unity to Left-minded people, and by speaking to tens of thousands in its own name made a contribution to the victory."

It called the election "a stinging rebuff to the arrogant bid of extreme reaction for government power. . . . But it is no guarantee that what the people voted for—peace, civil rights, greater democracy and a real war on poverty—are now assured."

"The ultra-Right, although badly beaten in the election, still represents a formidable force. . . . It aims to weld together a phalanx of racist and fascist-minded forces ready to go to any limit, even armed violence, to thwart the national will and to achieve its ends. The November 3rd election was only the first major battle with the ultra-Right, not the decisive nor final one."

Johnson's Capitalist Supporters: The capitalist groups who for their own reasons, opposed Goldwater and "gave varying degrees of support" to Johnson, "will now endeavor to interpret the election mandate in their own way and in their own interest." These groups "realize that concessions to greater Negro equality are inevitable. Yet many of them do not want a complete end to discrimination NOW, and certainly do not want it in industry, for that would cut into their profits. Nor do they want a radical change in the South with higher wages and living standards."

"Likewise they are opposed to a shorter work week and a massive federally financed building program to create the jobs and decent housing without which the very promise of Negro equality becomes a mockery."

After discussing the class forces at work in the two parties it concluded, "It would be a major mistake to believe that the overwhelming victory of the national Democratic ticket represented a blind allegiance to the Democratic Party or an unconditional vote of confidence in President Johnson and his policies. There was more split-ticket voting this year than in any previous election."

Labor-Negro Alliance: Referring to the part played by the Negro people in the election, it said "there is the basis for a natural alliance between the labor and Negro people's movements," adding, "When the spirit that today animates the Negro people's movement sweeps over into the ranks of labor, a great new rebirth of the labor movement will take place. It will complete the job of organizing the millions of still un-

organized industrial, white-collar and professional workers, including the South, squarely face the unprecedented challenge of automation, and place itself in the recognized leadership of all those working for social progress in the United States."

On the question of a third party, the CP statement predicted that "The day will surely come when socialist-minded people, trade unionists and progressives generally, will have a major electoral party of their own, representing their combined interests and not that of big capital." But at present, "Whatever significant independent volunteer forms of political expression exist have as their immediate objective the aim of influencing the outcome of the struggle within and between the two major parties."

For the present, it suggests that, "Third party candidates should be put forward wherever this can help crystallize the mass movement and struggle and where no meaningful choice is given the people. Under no circumstances should they be put forward where this would mean a head-on collision with the labor or Negro people's movements or where the only result would be the victory of the ultra-Right. But certainly the Left should actively urge the labor and Negro people's movements to begin fighting for increased representation all along the line, to put forth their own more advanced candidates in primary struggles and to refuse to go along with the machine-chosen political hacks. Likewise, it should help stimulate the formation of a liberal-progressive bloc in Congress and in state and city legislative bodies."

It also declared its belief that the American people "will come to realize the necessity of taking the socialist path. But they will do so out of their own experience and in accord with specific American conditions and traditions."

Communist in California: Running in the primaries in Los Angeles on June 2, 1964, William C. Taylor, Southern California Communist Party spokesman, received nearly 1 out of every 8 votes cast in the race for 1 of the 5 seats on the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors.

This is the first time in more than 14 years that a Communist had run for office in Los Angeles. Taylor, a Negro, received 34,516 votes, or 13.7% of all votes cast for the office, in a district where about one-third of the voters are Negroes and Mexican-Americans. He ran against the incumbent Supervisor who redbaited him during the campaign.

All Taylor's literature referred to him as a Communist spokesman. One of the local Negro papers placed him on its recommended list; another one rejected his advertising. His campaign stressed the need for jobs, civil rights, housing and equal educational opportunities.

"The central issues of our campaign," as he put it (*Political Affairs*, Sept. 1964) were: "representation of Negroes and Mexican-Americans on the Board of Supervisors, and in appointive offices in top legislative

and administrative bodies of Los Angeles County; tax reform to reduce the staggering load on small homeowners by increasing taxes on large corporations, industries and commercial establishments; an adequate welfare program administered on the basis of fairness and equality; and the right of minority political opinions to be represented on all levels of government."

SOCIALIST PARTY

Convention of the Socialist Party at Chicago May 29-31, 1964, rejected proposals to offer a Presidential ticket. It was attended by almost a hundred delegates and alternates from 31 states. The Party now has under 10,000 members and a semi-monthly paper, *New America*.

It re-elected as National Chairman Darlington Hoopes of Reading, Pa., the presidential candidate in 1952 and 1956. Norman Thomas who ran for President six times was elected to the newly created post of Honorary Chairman.

The convention spent most of its time in considering the Party's program for the next two years. The resolution on civil rights gave strong support to the voter registration campaign throughout the South, and all other activities related to the civil rights revolution.

It noted the limitation of the elementary demands for civil rights which, even if achieved "will not substantially alter the daily existence of the mass of Negroes so long as poverty and unemployment stalk the Negro community, so long as mushrooming slums and deteriorating schools continue to wall them off from the affluent white society." So the SP demanded a \$30 billion federal public works program geared to clearance of all slums, rebuilding of urban centers around vast thoroughly integrated educational parks, rehousing of all slum dwellers. This works program would offer employment to the mass of Negroes.

Unity of the trade union movement and the civil rights organizations was stressed as essential for success of this program.

Foreign Policy: The Foreign Affairs section of the platform said both the "American capitalist establishment" and the "totalitarian Communist bloc" had used "imperialist tactics." It designated the "Baltic States" as among those such as Spain, Portugal and Haiti "occupied by a foreign power or totalitarian rule." It referred to "the expansion of Communist tyranny into Eastern Europe" while calling the present Cuban government the "totalitarian Castro regime." However, it advocated a general policy of "Hands Off Cuba."

On a world scale it advocated the "disengagement of the Socialist Parties and trade unions from current cold war politics. They must break with a foreign policy that has been based on support of NATO and alliance with the United States."

It gave strong support to disarmament, the development of the UN, and disengagement of U.S. armed forces abroad and substitution of a great war on poverty in place of the arms race. It specifically called for U.S. recognition of the People's Republic of China as well as the entrance of that country into the UN. On the Vietnam war it demanded that the U.S. government "use every effort by negotiation to bring about neutralization of Vietnam. . . . Under no circumstances should men and money be invested further in war in Southeast Asia."

AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

Hubert Humphrey as a member of the Americans for Democratic Action helped to bring this organization into the spotlight in the 1964 campaign. It was attacked by the Goldwater forces as "one of the far-left groups" of the U.S. Humphrey resigned his post as one of the 13 ADA Vice Chairmen, but refused to yield any further ground even when Republican Vice Presidential candidate Miller called ADA a vehicle for "foreign Socialist totalitarianism."

Actually ADA, formed in 1947, spearheaded the liberal counteroffensive against the Progressive Party whose candidate in 1948 was former Vice President Henry Wallace. It called the PP a front for the Communists in the U.S.

During the McCarthyite period ADA was attacked as Red itself although it always barred Communists from membership and was in the forefront of the anti-Communist drive of that day.

Cabell Phillips in the *N.Y. Times* (Oct. 11, 1964) described ADA as an organization of "New Dealers, Fair Dealers and other 'activists' in the population, including some Socialists who are impatient with the normal pace and direction of the two major parties toward social reform and international cooperation." It had over 50,000 members, including dozens of well-known public officials and about 100 local chapters. Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt was described as "a founder and, in effect, the patron saint of the organization today." Labor leader Walter Reuther is one of its Vice Chairmen and its national board of 90 includes union leaders I. W. Abel, Joseph A. Beirne, David Dubinsky, Ralph Helstein and Arnold S. Zander.

Liberal and Internationalist: Over the years, Phillips reported, the ADA "has championed virtually every liberal and internationalist program that the Government has adopted—and a good many that were rejected." They have had sharp differences with many of those they now support. For example, when Lyndon Johnson was majority leader in the U.S. Senate he was repeatedly criticized for collaborating with the Republican Administration to scuttle liberal legislation.

The ADA calls itself "a liberal, independent political organization." It is independent, it says "in the sense that it is neither a political party nor attached to any political party. Thus it is free of party discipline and able to take independent positions on policy and politics. It works to strengthen liberal tendencies in both parties and oppose conservative policies in both."

Its 60-page *Program for Americans* in 1964 included practically all the reforms and proposals of organized labor on the domestic front. In international affairs it was well to the left of AFL-CIO in that it called upon the Administration "to oppose widening the area of combat operations in North Vietnam and the making of further substantial commitments of arms and forces in South Vietnam." And it urged admission of the Peoples Republic of China to the UN and U.S. diplomatic recognition of that government.

When the U.S. stepped up its bombing of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam in Feb. 1965 ADA issued a special bulletin urging its members to help stop Washington's "escalation of the war," to stop the North Vietnam bombings, to urge world-wide call for a cease-fire.

Election Appraisal: After the 1964 election Leon Shull, National Director of ADA, reported that "Every candidate for the Senate who had a liberal quotient of 75% or more on the ADA Voting Record, with the exception of Pierre Salinger, was reelected." And the results on high-scoring candidates for the House were "equally striking." Sizing up the post-election situation, Vice Chairman Robert R. Nathan, economic consultant, said: "We should be under no illusions that this was a smashing victory that will assure a liberal program." It served more "as a decisive rejection of Goldwater conservatism than it did to establish a clear liberal policy mandate for President Johnson." Nathan thought the ADA might have a growing role within the Republican Party. He said, "Our members can and do work in Republican primaries to assure moderate and liberal representation within that party and they can help secure the doom of Goldwaterites."

ONE MAN ONE VOTE

The malapportionment of seats both in the U.S. Congress and in the state legislatures has long been a notorious defect in U.S. democracy. As pointed out in *Labor Fact Book 16*, less than 15% of the people choose a majority of the members of both houses in Florida, for example. In New York State the big city voters have about one-fourth the legislative representation of those in the country areas. In New Jersey they have a little more than one-fifth of those in most rural areas. Population of Congressional districts ranges from as low as 177,431 in the 12th District of Michigan to a high of 951,527 in the 5th District of Texas. In most

states the spread between the largest and the smallest districts runs into hundreds of thousands.

Supreme Court Decisions: The U.S. Supreme Court Feb. 17, 1964, in a major decision directed that the states parcel out seats in the U.S. House of Representatives among districts of approximately equal population. The majority opinion held that Article I, Section 2, of the U.S. Constitution requiring that the House of Representatives be chosen "by the people of the several states" means that, "as nearly as practicable, one man's vote in a Congressional election is to be worth as much as another's."

A previous decision of the high court in March 1962 took a similar position on the apportionment of seats in state legislatures and gave authority to federal courts to pass on the constitutionality of districting.

In a later decision in June 1964 the Court made it clear that both state legislative chambers, not just the lower house, had to have their seats based on population alone and that there could be no exception to the rule that all districts had to be substantially equal.

In this decision Chief Justice Warren made it clear that people are what counts. He said: "Legislators represent people, not trees or acres. Legislators are elected by voters, not farms or cities or economic interests." No matter where they live, the court held, all voters stand in the same relation to their government and must have equal voting strength. As Warren put it, "The right of suffrage can be denied by a debasement or dilution of the weight of a citizen's vote just as effectively as by wholly prohibiting the free exercise of the franchise."

It was expected that during 1965 about half of the states would act to redistrict one or both of their legislative houses. By early 1965 some 26 states were already under specific court order to redistrict. *Congressional Quarterly* reported that in 1964 law suits to force more equitable state legislative districts had been filed or implemented in a total of 39 states. Many of the suits were filed by union officials acting on behalf of state labor bodies.

Urban and Labor Benefits: In general the forces benefiting from the court's decisions have been the Northern Democrats and urban and labor interests that have long been frustrated by the disparity in legislative and congressional representation. The court rulings and their implementation were expected to increase the political power of the city and suburban areas at the expense of the rural areas and thus clear the way for more progressive legislation opposed by big business.

Prof. Andrew Hacker of Cornell University, writing on the subject in *N.Y. Times*, Nov. 8, 1964, said that, "While the general public has not become involved in the reapportionment issue, it is plain that many elected officials are deeply concerned. There are more than 7,000 state legislators, more of whom have something to lose than to gain by re-

districting, and these local politicians can expect to find fellow feeling among members of Congress and party leaders at all levels."

Opposition to the court rulings has taken various forms. A number of state legislatures passed resolutions calling on Congress to convoke a constitutional convention to draft an amendment overriding the Supreme Court's reapportionment decisions. And in Congress itself proposals for constitutional amendments were introduced in both House and Senate in 1964 attempting to nullify the Supreme Court's decisions in whole or in part.

Republican Moves: Defeated in the 88th Congress, Senator Dirksen and others in 1965 sponsored a proposed constitutional amendment that would allow one house of a state legislature to be elected "on a basis other than population."

Meantime legislation supporting the Court's decision was introduced in Congress aimed at eliminating gerrymandering of Congressional districts. A bill introduced by Rep. Celler and approved by the House Judiciary Committee in Feb. 1965 provided that no district could have a population varying by more than 15% from the population of the average Congressional district in the state.

GENERAL VOTING RESTRICTIONS

The special restrictions on voting used against Negroes in the Southern States are not the only ones that make it difficult for Americans generally to exercise the franchise. Some of these other restrictions were summarized in a report of the Commission on Registration and Voting Participation appointed by the late President Kennedy. It was presented to President Johnson on Dec. 20, 1963.

"One third of our adults," said the report, "do not vote in presidential elections, and more than half do not vote in congressional elections. . . . Restrictive legal and administrative procedures in registration and voting disfranchise millions. . . . Many election laws and administrative practices are unreasonable, unfair and outmoded. They obstruct the path to the ballot box."

Only 17 states allow registration by mail. This prevents tens of thousands of persons who may be called away on business from registering on the days designated.

Many states require a visit to the county courthouse instead of a local voting precinct. This frequently involves traveling long distances and standing in line for hours to register.

In several states registration closes too early thus preventing many from registering when election interest is at its peak.

Residence requirements are frequently too strict. For example, more

than 20 million persons changed residence in one year, 1961, millions of them losing their vote as a consequence.

Limitations on absentee voting also deprive many of the vote. And 3 states have no civilian absentee voting system at all.

Election Day procedures often discourage voters with inadequate and inefficient provisions resulting in long lines voting at inconvenient hours. Polls should remain open at least to 9 P.M.

Standards Proposed: The Commission proposed some 20 registration and voting standards to overcome these handicaps. Among the more important were: Provision to make voter registration simple and easy; state residence requirement limited to 6 months and local residence requirement to 30 days; new state residents should be allowed to vote for President; literacy tests should not be a requisite for voting (these are used most flagrantly to prevent Negroes from voting in southern states); lowering voting age to 18 years should be considered by the states (Georgia and Kentucky now permit voting at 18); right to vote should be extended to those living on federal reservations; absentee voting should be facilitated.

No citizen's registration should be cancelled for failure to vote in any period less than 4 years.

Especially important is the recommendation that candidacy should be open to all minority parties and should not be blocked with excessive primary costs, high filing fees as well as inability to meet a previous election's required number of votes in order to get on the ballot. Reasonable filing fees and minimum signature requirements are recommended.

The poll tax as a state requirement for voting should also be wiped out. (The constitutional amendment on this subject applies only to federal elections.)

A \$200 MILLION CAMPAIGN

The cost of being elected has been increasing over the years. Preliminary estimates of the amount spent in the 1964 elections give a total of about \$200 million compared with about \$175 million in 1960.

Reports on the amounts spent are required by law to be filed with the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House. But, as the *N.Y. Times* reported (Dec. 6, 1964), nobody reads them and "the official interest in the contents of the reports is acknowledgedly nil." No penalties have ever been laid on anyone for failure to file.

Committee Expenditures: One of the reports filed with the House was by the Johnson-for-President Committee which reported it collected and spent more than \$700,000. It was only one of about a dozen national committees that were engaged in raising funds for the same purpose. The multiplication of committees is due to the regula-

tion that no individual may contribute more than \$3,000 to a national committee, and no such committee is allowed to spend more than \$3 million. But there is no legal ceiling on the number of national campaign committees that may be formed to spend \$3 million each, or how many donations of up to \$3,000 an individual may spread around over these committees.

An interesting example of this proliferation of committees in a congressional election was the case of Richard Ottinger, successful progressive Democratic candidate from the 25th district of New York, who beat Robert Barry, the incumbent Republican. In his campaign Ottinger had to set up 34 committees, to 22 of which the only contributors were his wealthy mother and sister. His victory cost \$193,000 and all the giving and spending was strictly within the law. Of the total, \$174,000 was contributed by his relatives.

It is estimated that running for a U.S. Senate seat requires the expenditure of at least \$500,000. Joseph D. Tydings (D.) had to spend that much to win even in the small state of Maryland. George Murphy (R.) to beat Pierre Salinger in California listed campaign costs of more than \$600,000. But Robert F. Kennedy and his backers reported spending about \$2 million to win a New York seat from Republican Senator Keating who spent almost as much.

Running for Governor of a state is equally expensive. A report to *Labor* (Jan. 16, 1965) from the capital of Florida said the *St. Petersburg Times* early in 1965 reminded its readers that Haydon Burns, former mayor of Jacksonville and political conservative, was "the first man in Florida history to collect and spend more than \$1 million to get elected to political office."

Rich Man's Game: Even the cost of running in state primary elections is prohibitive for any but very rich men. Ian Sclanders in "Politics: The Rich Man's Game" (*The Nation*, March 2, 1964) reports: "John F. Kennedy, by his own accounting, laid out \$912,000 before the Democrats nominated him" in 1960. And this did not cover the expenditures of Kennedy enthusiasts in their own communities.

In the California primary contest in 1964 State Comptroller Alan Cranston and Pierre Salinger spent about \$1 million each battling for the Democratic nomination for U.S. Senator. (*U.S. News & World Report*, Jan. 4, 1965.)

From such figures the *N.Y. Times* concluded editorially, Nov. 28, 1964: "The spectacle of ever more lavish campaign spending is deeply disturbing. A candidate trying to raise such large sums may have to entangle himself in private understandings that are at least potentially compromising. The high cost of campaigning has also made it increasingly difficult for men of ordinary means to run for public office."

MILLIONS SPENT BY RIGHT WING GROUPS

An intensive study entitled *The Finances of the Right Wing*, by Group Research Inc. found that 30 major groups spent \$14.3 million in 1963. It estimates that others spent at least as much or more, making a total of approximately \$30 million for the year. (*Group Research Report*, Sept. 15, 1964.) A summary of much of this material was contained in an article in the *New Republic*, Sept. 19, 1964, by William K. Wyant, Jr. of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*.)

As a whole, Group Research found that the income for the 30 operations rose from \$4.9 million in 1958 to \$12.2 million in 1962 to \$14.3 million in 1963, the latter figure being based on the trend reflected by actual figures available from half of the 30.

Organizations grossing more than \$500,000 each during 1962 include H. L. Hunt's Life Line Foundation, John Birch Society Inc., Billy James Hargis' Christian Crusade, Fred Schwartz's Christian Anti-Communism Crusade, Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge, *National Review*, Manion Forum, Foundation for Economic Education, American Economic Foundation, Carl McIntire's Twentieth Century Reformation Hour, Dan Smoot and *Human Events*.

Group Research cautioned that the major financial support of Right-wing groups is not just a few billionaires. It says that "funds come from many small contributors as well as from a cluster of fairly big, steady contributors to Right-wing causes."

Wealthy Family Support: Some of the wealthy families contributing directly or through foundations they have established are Milliken, Pew, Chance, Edison, Heinsohn, Lilly, Crede, Allen Bradley, Harnischfeger, Donner, Dresser; also General Wood of Sears Roebuck.

Among lesser individual contributors mentioned in the study are "a variety of businessmen, the best known being Lemuel R. Boulware, a former executive of General Electric; Patrick Frawley; H. L. Hunt; Harold Luhnnow, head of the Volker Fund; Alfred P. Sloan, former General Motors executive; the Richardson Foundation of the Vick Chemical family; Walter Knott of Los Angeles . . . and Hope Gray and Olive Simes, who are principals of the mysterious Penthouse Trust in Boston and supporters of the John Birch Society."

Some Tax-exempt: No less than 17 of the 30 have been given a tax-exempt status by the Internal Revenue Service even though they are not involved in activities which could be described as "educational" or "religious." This means that persons contributing to these organizations may deduct the amount of their support from their taxable income. This leaves the other taxpayers of the country, in effect, paying

increased taxes and thus indirectly supporting these Right-wing organizations.

Business firms that sponsor radio and television programs by these outfits charge off their expenditures to "advertising." This also represents an item deductible from taxable income. The same applies to advertising purchased in publications of these organizations, for example, *American Opinion* of the John Birch Society, *Human Events* and the *National Review*.

Danger on the Right: A book called *Danger on the Right* was prepared by the Anti-Defamation League and published by Random House in 1964. Authored by League counsel Arnold Forster and national director Benjamin Epstein, the study classifies 5 groups as "the radical right" and 5 others as the "extreme conservatives." And even further to the Right, not covered in the book, are what it calls "the rabble-rousing gutter bigot who combines political extremism with promoting racial and religious hatred."

This study also discusses some of the sources of Right-wing money, including 70-odd foundations, 114 corporations and a number of wealthy individuals. Heavy contributors to the ultra-Right, it found, are such corporations as U.S. Steel, Republic Steel, Gulf Oil and the Humble Oil & Refining Co. related to the Esso and Standard Oil companies.

Other companies, although not contributing directly, used the materials sent out by various extremist organizations. For example, the John Birch Society film, "Communism on the Map," was used by hundreds of major companies including Goodyear Tire, Aluminum Co. of America, Jones & Laughlin Steel, Revere Copper & Brass, and Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co.

INDEX

- Abel, I. W., 145
- Aiken, Sen. George D., 66
- Alien Registration Act, 101
- Allen, Donna, 62, 100
- Allen, Louis, 85
- Alliance for Progress, 113-114
- Amalgamated Clothing Workers, 115; on test ban treaty, 59
- American Civil Liberties Union, 76, 82, 92, 97-98, 104
- American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, 105, 106
- American Economic Foundation, 151
- American Federation of Government Employees, 122
- American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations, 31, 34, 36, 38, 39, 49-50, 76, 122, 139; convention, 110-114; foreign policy, 113, 129
- American Federation of Teachers, 120-121
- American Friends Service Committee, 64
- American Indians, 47, 54-55, 72
- American Medical Ass'n, 45, 113
- American Opinion*, 152
- American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 30
- Americans for Democratic Action, 106, 145
- Americans for the Preservation of the White Race, 84
- Americus, Ga., 89
- Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of U.S. Senate, 18
- Appalachia, 16, 27
- Aptheker, Herbert, 76, 103
- Armaments, 29, 56-57
- Armed Forces Day Parade, 65
- Atomic arms race, 56
- Austrian State Treaty, 58
- Automation, 41, 111, 112
- Automobile industry, 9; fringe benefits, 118; paid holidays, 119, pension improvements, 119
- Auto Workers, 37, 39, 46, 76, 115, 116, 140; strikes, 123, 124, 125
- Bagdikian, Ben H., on poverty, 26
- Balance of payments, 22, 23
- Barkan, Alexander, 139
- Bartlett, Sen. E. L., 66, 141
- Beirne, Joseph A., 145
- Bergman, Peter G., on chemical warfare, 66
- Berkeley Free Speech Movement, 68, 108
- Bernstein, Richard J., 81
- Biemiller, Andrew J., 134
- Bimba, Anthony, 107
- Birmingham children, 85
- Black, Justice Hugo L., 103
- Blair, John F., 19
- Blau, Patricia, 101
- Boeing Co., 58
- Boston, Negro boycotts in, 80; Negro ghettos in, 93
- Boulware, Lemuel R., 151
- Braceros (seasonal workers), 51
- Braden, Anne, 95, 99
- Braden, Carl, 95
- Branigin, Gov. Roger D., 128
- Brennan, Justice William J., 109
- Brooke, Edward W., 137
- Brown, Archie, 97, 104
- Brown, Rep. George E., 66
- Brown, Willie, 137
- Buber, Martin, 105
- Budgets, family, 31; federal, 16-17; military, 17
- Buffalo, school segregation in, 79
- Bunche, Ralph, 91
- Burton, Rep. Phillip, 66
- Business-Industrial Political Action Committee (BIPAC), 113
- California, Communist's campaign in, 143; housing legislation in, 92
- Cambridge, Md., school boycotts in, 80
- Campaign expenditures, 149
- Canada, 13; trade union membership, 110
- Capital outlays, 10
- Cash flow, 14
- Cater, D. C., on Chicago slums, 41
- Catholic Worker*, 65
- Celler, Emanuel, 148
- Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, 59, 93
- Chafee, Gov. John H., 139
- Chaney, James E., 83
- Chemical warfare, 66
- Chemical Workers Union, 116
- Chester, Pa., school boycotts in, 80
- Chicago, school segregation in, 79; slums, 41
- Children, in poverty, 26, 40, 41, 47
- China, *see* People's Republic of China
- Christian Anti-Communism Crusade, 151
- Christian Crusade, 151
- Church, Sen. Frank, 65, 141
- Church bombing and burning in South, 84
- Churches, and peace, 70
- Cincinnati, school boycotts in, 80
- Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties, 102-103
- Civil defense, 63

- Civil liberties, 97-109
- Civil Rights Act of 1964, 44, 76, 78, 131; AFL-CIO on, 112; Industrial Union Dept. on, 115
- Cleveland, school segregation in, 79
- Cogen, Charles, 121
- Cold war, 15, 23, 56, 129
- Collins, LeRoy, 77
- Commager, Henry Steele, 99
- Commission on Registration and Voting Participation, 148
- CERGE (Com. to Defend Resistance to Ghetto Life), 95
- Committee for Nonviolent Action, 64, 65, 67, 68
- Committee on Political Education (COPE), 139
- Committee on Un-American Activities, 60, 62, 97-100, 104, 107, 109
- Communications Workers, 115
- Communist Party USA, 101-102, 105, 137, 142-144
- Community Centers, in Mississippi, 81
- Community Relations Service, 76
- Companies with military contracts, 19
- Company contributors to Right Wing, 152
- Concentration, in agriculture, 20-21; in industry, 18-19
- Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), 74, 77, 80, 81, 94
- Congress, U.S., sessions of, 1963-1964, 131-134; changes in, 135; Negroes in, 135; unionists in, 140; women in, 136
- Connor, John T., 22
- Conservation of national wilderness, 132
- Conservative Party, 140, 141
- Constitution Party, 140
- Consumer expenditures, 10
- Consumer price index, 11, 119
- Consumer protection bill, 133
- Conyers, Rep. John J., 66, 135
- Cost of living, 11, 41
- Council of Economic Advisers, 9, 10, 11, 25, 26
- Council of Federated Organizations, 81-83, 85, 87
- Council for a Liveable World, 69
- Cranston, Alan, 150
- Crockett, George, 82
- Cuba, 15, 60, 103-104, 113, 129, 144
- Dangerous jobs, 37
- Daniels, Carolyn, 89
- Davis, Benjamin J., 102
- Davis, Jerome, 70
- Dawson, Rep. William L., 136
- Debt, consumers, 10; farmers, 21
- Dee, Henry H., 86
- Democratic Party, 135, 142
- Democratic Republic of Vietnam, 60, 130
- Denmark, 47
- Deportations, 106-107
- Depressed areas, 27
- Desegregation, in southern schools, 77
- Devine, Annie, 87
- Diggs, Rep. Charles C., Jr., 136
- Dirksen, Sen. Everett M., 148
- Disarmament, 114
- Dividends, 14
- Dombrowski, James A., 109
- Dominican Republic, 15, 69
- Douglas, Sen. Paul, 133, 140
- Dow, Rep. John G., 66
- Dubinsky, David, 130, 145
- DuBois, W. E. B., 76; Clubs, 68, 137
- Dudley, Edward R., 137
- Dumpson, James, 43
- duPont family, 30
- Eastland, Sen. James O., 99
- Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, 28, 132
- Economic trends, 9-23
- Edwards, Corwin D., 20
- Edwards, Rep. Don, 66, 100
- Edwards, Rev. V. A., 137
- Elections, 1964, 134-146
- Electrical workers (IBEW), 115, 124; (UE), 40
- Ellender, Sen. Allen J., 66
- Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, 108
- Emerson, Thomas I., 99
- Epstein, Benjamin, 152
- Epton, William, 94
- Equal Pay Act, 33
- Evans, Gov. Daniel J., 139
- Evers, Medgar, 85
- Exports, 22
- Factory worker agreements, 117
- Fair Labor Standards Act, 33, 37, 49, 132
- Farbstein, Rep. Leonard, 100
- Farmer, James, 75
- Farmers, 20-22
- Farm workers, 36, 39, 50, 133
- FEPC laws, 75
- Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), 95, 102
- Federal Trade Commission, 18, 20
- Federation of American Scientists, 67
- Fellowship of Reconciliation, 70
- Flynn, Elizabeth Gurley, 101, 103
- Food for peace, 133
- Food stamp plan, 133
- Ford Motor Co., 125; strike, 123
- Foreign aid, 23
- Foreign-born, 105

- Foreign investment, 22
 Foreign policy, of AFL-CIO, 113, 129;
 of Socialist Party, 144
 Forster, Arnold, 152
 Foundation for Economic Education, 151
 France, 13, 22
 Frawley, Patrick, 151
 Free speech at Berkeley, 108
 Freedman, Blanch, 107
 Freedom Foundation, 151
 Freedom Schools, in Mississippi, 81
 Friends Committee on Nat'l Legislation,
 63, 131
 Fringe benefits, 118
 Fulbright, Sen. J. William, 66

 Galamison, Milton A., 80
 "General assistance," 42
 General Dynamics Corp., 58
 Geneva conferences, on disarmament, 63
 German Democratic Republic, 60
 Ghettos, 93
 Goldwater, Barry, 113, 128, 134, 136,
 137, 138, 139, 140, 142, 145, 146
 Gomillion, Charles G., 137
 Goodman, Andrew, 83
 Gorman, Patrick E., 130
 Gray, Victoria, 87
 Great Britain, 13, 47, 58
 Green, Rep. Edith, 66
 Greenwich Village Peace Center, 65
 Gross national product, 9, 12
 Gruening, Sen. Ernest, 65, 66, 69, 130

 Hacker, Andrew, 147
 Hall, Gus, 102, 105
 Hamer, Fannie Lou, 87
 Hargis, Billy James, 151
 Harisiades, Peter, 106
 Harlem, 93, 95, 117
 Harlem Defense Council, 94
 Hawkins, Rep. Augustus F., 136
 Health, 39, 45, 46, 55; program in Con-
 gress, 133
 Helstein, Ralph, 145
 Henderson, V. W., 71
 Henry, Aaron, 86
 Hentoff, Nat, 93
 Highlander Folk School, 99
 Hill, Herbert, 74
 Hood, Otis, 102
 Hoopes, Darlington, 144
 Hoover, J. Edgar, 137
 Hotel & Restaurant Employees, 115
 Hours of work, 48-50; of farm oper-
 ators, 49
 Housing, 10, 132; of aged, 44; of Ameri-
 can Indians, 55; of migrant workers,
 51; of Negroes in armed services, 92;
 segregation, 92

 HUAC, *see* Committee on Un-American
 Activities
 Hughes Tool Co., 74
 Human Events, 151, 152
 Humphrey, Hubert, 59, 135, 145
 Hunt, H. L., 151
 Hunter, Marjorie, on Appalachia, 28
 Hutcheson, Maurice, 139
 Hutchins, Robert M., 59
 Hyndman, Katherine, 106

 Immigration & Naturalization Act of
 1952, 106
 Income, distribution of, 24, 30; of aged,
 44; of farm workers, 50; of Negroes,
 26; of Puerto Ricans, 53; in South, 30
 Industrial accidents, 37
 Industrial production, 9
 Industrial and Research Scientists Com-
 mittee on Vietnam, 70
 Industrial Union Dept. (AFL-CIO), 37,
 89, 114-115
 Infant mortality, 28, 47
 Integration, 99
 Int'l Convocation on the Requirements
 for Peace, 59
 International Ladies Garment Workers,
 115, 127
 Int'l Longshoremens' Ass'n, 127
 Israel, 47
 Italy, 13, 22

 Jackson, James Lee, 91
 Jackson, Miss., 89
 James, Dr. George, on poverty, 28
 Japan, 13
 Javits, Sen. Jacob, 66
 John Birch Society, 129, 141, 151, 152
 Johnson, Leroy, 137
 Johnson, Lewis M., 102
 Johnson, Lyndon B., 11-12, 15, 33, 35,
 44, 55, 90, 91, 135, 136, 137, 138,
 142, 145
 Johnson, Sen. Olin D., 66
 Jones, Claudia, 106
 Jones, Theodore A., 137

 Keating, Kenneth, 139, 140
 Kennedy, James A., 46-47
 Kennedy, John F., 11, 66, 75, 111, 131,
 148, 150
 Kennedy, Robert F., 139, 150
 Kerr-Mills Act, 46
 Keyserling, Leon H., on farm income,
 20, 21; on poverty, 25, 27; on unem-
 ployment insurance coverage, 34
 King, Rev. Edwin, 86
 King, Rev. Martin Luther, Jr., 75, 88,
 90, 91
 Kistiakowsky, George, 57

- Klunder, Rev. Bruce W., 79
 Knoll, Erwin, 78, 79
 Korean War, 14, 107
 Krebs, Rep. Paul J., 139
 Ku Klux Klan, 83, 84, 86, 91, 96
 Kunstler, William M., 82

Labor Today, 46
 Ladies Garment Workers, 105, 127, 130
 Lamont, Corliss, 107, 108
 Lee, Herbert, 86
 Lewis, John, 65, 89
 Lieberman, Myron, 120
 Life expectancy, 47
 Life Line Foundation, 151
 Lindsay, John V., on gas warfare in Vietnam, 67
 Liuzzo, Viola Gregg, 91
 Livingston, David, 130
 Lockheed Aircraft Corp., 58
 Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 74
 Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, 49, 69
 Low wages, 31, 36, 42
 Lowry, John C., 96
 Lumer, Hyman, 29, 102
 Lynching, of civil rights workers, 83
 Lynn, Conrad, 94

 Mail curb, 107
 Mallory, Willie Mae, 96
 Manion Forum, 151
 Manpower Development and Training Act, 132
 Manpower Report, 11-13, 33, 55, 73
 Mansfield, Sen. Mike, 66, 139
 Margolius, Sidney, 133
 Marion, Ala., 90
 Marshall, Burke, 89
 Marzani, Carl, 65
 Mass transit act, 133
 Massachusetts Political Action for Peace (PAX), 69
 May 2nd Movement, 65, 68-69
 Mazey, Emil, 130
 McCarran Act, 101
 McCarthy, Sen. Eugene J., 66
 McCarthy-King Bill, 35
 McCarthy-Mills Bill, 35
 McDonnell Aircraft Corp., 58
 McGovern, Sen. George S., 61, 65
 McIntire, Rev. Carl, 141, 151
 McNamara, Robt. S., 56, 70
 McTernan, John T., 104
 Means, Gardiner C., 18, 19
 Meany, George, 110, 113, 139
 Medicare, 45
 Megadevastation, 57
 Meiklejohn, Alexander, 99
 Mergers, 14, 20
 Mexicans, 47
 Meyers, George, 28
 Migrant workers, 51
 Military budget and expenditures, 17, 22, 23, 29, 62
 Military contractors, 57-58
 Miller, Rep. William, 134
 Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers, 126
 Minimum wages, 23, 35-37, 51, 112
 Mining, accidents in, 38
 Mink, Rep. Patsy T., 136
 Minority parties, 140-145
 Minton, Lee, 139
 Minutemen, 141
 Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, 86-88
 Mississippi Summer Project, 81
 Money, in elections, 149, 151
 Monopoly, 18
 Monroe frame-up, 95
 Montgomery, Ala., 90-91
 Moonlighting, 49
 Moore, Charles, 86
 Morris, Prof. Arval A., 103
 Morris, George, on unionists in Congress, 140
 Morse, Sen. Wayne B., 65, 66, 69
 Moses, Bob, 81
 Moss, Sen. Frank E., 141
 Motley, Constance Baker, 91
 Mueller, Willard G., 18
 MLF (Multilateral nuclear force), 61-63
 Murphy, Sen. George, 150

 Nathan, Robert R., 146
 Nat'l Ass'n for Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), 74, 77, 80, 81, 82
 National Ass'n of Manufacturers, 113, 129
 Nat'l Ass'n for Puerto Rican Civil Rights, on school boycott, 54
 Nat'l Committee to Abolish HUAC, 99
 National Congress of Indians, 55
 National Education Ass'n, 120-121
National Guardian, 100
 National Labor Relations Act, 114
 National Lawyers Guild, 82, 109
 National Maritime Union, 127
 National Policy Committee on Pockets of Poverty, 26
National Review, 151, 152
 National States Rights Party, 140
 National Urban League, 71
 Negroes, 71-96; in Congress, 135-136; discrimination, 73, 75; in elections, 136-137; health 28, 47; housing, 26, 92; incomes, 26, 71; poverty, 29; segregation, 92; women workers, 72, 116, 126; unemployment, 73
 Nelson, Sen. Gaylord A., 66

- Neuberger, Sen. Maurine B., 136
 Newark, Negro ghettos in, 93
 Newberry, Mike, 134
 Newspaper strike, 123
 New York City, minimum wages in, 37;
 poverty, 28; Puerto Ricans in, 52;
 relief rolls in, 43
 New York State, minimum wages in, 36
 Nix, Rep. Robert B. C., 136
 Nixon, Russ, 100
 North, school segregation in, 79
 North American Aviation, 58
 Northern Student Movement, 68
 Norway, 47
 Nuclear arms, 56-57
 Nuclear test ban, 58, 62, 114

 Occupational diseases, 39
 Office of Employment Opportunity, 28
 Old-age, survivors and disability insur-
 ance, 40-41
 Older workers, 43-45
 Omaha, Negro ghettos in, 93
 Ornati, Oscar, 26
 Ottinger, Rep. Richard, 150
 "Overkill" capacity, 57

 Packinghouse Workers, 123
 Paid holidays, 119
 Paolucci, Prof. Henry, 140
 "Parity ratio," 21
 Passport restrictions, 103
 Paul, Maurice, 107
 Pauling, Linus, 70, 105; on nuclear test-
 ing, 58
 Peace issues and activities, 56-70, 100
Peking Review, 108
 Pell, Sen. Claiborne, 66
 Penn, Lemuel, 86
 Pension plans, union, 40, 118, 119, 126-
 128
 People's Republic of China, 47, 60, 62,
 63, 64, 103, 129, 145, 146
 Phoenix, Ariz., Negro ghettos in, 93
 Physicians, under social security, 40
 Planters Peanut Co., 126
 Poland, 132
 Police terror, 94
Political Affairs, 103, 137
 Political education, in Mississippi, 81
 Poll taxes, 91, 149
 Pope John XXIII, 59
 Portland, Ore., school segregation in, 79
 Poverty in U.S., 11, 25-32; of Negroes,
 26, 71
 Powell, Rep. Adam C., 136
 Powell, James, 86, 94
 Press, and the 1964 elections, 138
 Prices, 10, 21
 Productivity, 11, 111

 Profits, 13, 30
 Progressive Labor Movement, 94
 Prohibition Party, 140
 Promoting Enduring Peace, 70
 Public assistance, 40
 Public works, 112
 Puerto Ricans, in U.S., 28, 47, 52, 53, 80
 Puerto Rican Forum, 54

 Quakers, 63

 Radiation poison, 56
 Railroad workers, 125
 Randolph, A. Philip, 64, 76, 112-113,
 130
 Real wages, 32
 Reapportionment, 146-147
 Recessions, 11
 Reeb, Rev. James, 90
 Republican Party, 134, 148
 Research and development, 58
 Restrictions, on voting, 148
 Retail Clerks, 115
 Retail, Wholesale & Department Store
 Union, 116, 126
 Reuther, Walter, 76, 114, 145
 Rich family support for Right Wing, 151
 Right to travel, 103
 "Right-to-Work" laws, 128
 Right Wing, 113, 141, 142, 151, 152
 Rockefeller, Gov. Nelson, 134
 Romney, Gov. George, 139
 Rosenblum, Frank, 130
 Rubber workers, 48
 Russell, Bertrand, 105
 Russell, Rose, 116-117
 Rustin, Bayard, 80
 Rutstein, Dr. David D., on health, 47
 Ryan, Rep. William F., 66, 87, 100, 101

 Salinger, Pierre, 146, 150
 Saltonstall, Sen. Leverett, 66
 SANE (Committee for a Sane Nuclear
 Policy), 62, 130
 Sartre, Jean-Paul, 105
 Schaff, Adam, 60
 Scherer, Rep. Gordon, 107
 Schools, boycotts of, 80; desegregation in
 South, 77; segregation in North, 79
 Schwartz, Fred, 151
 Schwerner, Michael H., 83
Scientific American, 57
 Scranton, Gov. William, 134
 Scripto, Inc., 116
 Segregation; in housing, 92; in schools,
 77-80
 Selma, Ala., 89
 Senate Special Committee on Unemploy-
 ment Problems, 42
 Sheet Metal Workers, 74

- Sherman, Joseph, 106
 Shriver, Sargent, 28
 Simes, Olive, 151
 Sloan, Alfred P., 151
 Small Business Committee of U.S. Senate, 19
 Smith Act, 101
 Smith, Benjamin E., 109
 Smith, Louise Pettibone, 106
 Smith, Margaret Chase, 136
 Smoot, Dan, 151
 Sobell, Morton, 105
 Social Security Act, 51; 1965 amendments of, 39-40, 45
 Social workers, 116
 Socialist Labor Party, 140
 Socialist Party, 144-145
 Socialist Workers Party, 140
 South, elections in, 136; Negro education in, 78; school desegregation in, 77-78; unemployment in, 35; union contracts in, 117
 South Vietnam National Liberation Front, 130
 Southern Conference Educational Fund, 109
 Southern Education Reporting Service, 77-78
 Southern Regional Council, 88
 Southern Student Organizing Committee, 68
 Soviet Union, 47, 56, 57, 58, 63, 114, 129
 Spain, 22
 Spock, Dr. Benjamin, 69
 Standard of living, 31
 Steel industry, 9
 Steiner, Stan, on American Indians, 54
 Strikes of 1963-1964, 116, 118, 122-126; aluminum workers, 126; atomic trades workers, 123; automobile workers, 116, 123; chemical workers, 116; communications workers, 125; dock workers, 122; electrical workers, 124; hotel workers, 123; longshoremen, 122, 125; mine workers, 124, 125; newspaper men, 123, 126; packinghouse workers, 123; railroad workers, 124-125; restaurant workers, 124; retail clerks, 116, 126; rubber workers, 123; social workers, 116, 125; steel workers, 9, 123; teachers, 116, 120, 124; textile workers, 123
 Studebaker Corp., pension plan losses, 127
 Student Committee for Travel to Cuba, 104
 Student-faculty peace action, 68
 Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), 68, 75, 81, 89
 Student Peace Union, 65, 68-69
 Students for a Democratic Society, 67
 Subversive Activities Control Act, 109
 "Subversive List," of U.S. Attorney General, 109
 Suffridge, James, 139
 Sweden, 13, 47
 Szillard, Leo, 69
 Tauber, Karl, on residential segregation, 93
 Taft-Hartley Act, 125, 128
 Taxes, 13, 15; cut in, 9, 132; sales, 17
 Taylor, William C., 143
 Teachers Union, 116, 120
 Teach-ins, on Vietnam, 67, 69
 Teamsters, 110, 139
 Teixeira, Edward, 102
 Telesford, Darwin W., 137
 Test ban treaty, 60
 Textile Workers Union, 128
 Thomas, Norman, 144
 Timpson, Ann Burlak, 102
 Trade unions, 110-130
 Travis, Helen, 103
 "Truth-in-Lending" Bill, 133
 Tydings, Sen. Joseph, 141, 150
 Unemployment, 10, 11, 12, 28, 42, 52, 110; among American Indians, 54; Negroes, 73; Puerto Ricans, 52; youth, 33
 Unemployment insurance, 34, 51
 Union contracts, 117-118
 Union gains, in 1963, 117-118; in 1964, 118
 Unionists, in Congress, 139
 Unions, 110-130; of government employees, 121, of teachers, 120
 United Mine Workers, 110, 124, 125, 127
 United Nations, 60, 145
 United Packinghouse Workers, 73, 116
 United States Commission on Civil Rights, 73
 United States Supreme Court, 103, 147
 United Steel Workers, 127
 United World Federalists, 62
 Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, 133
 USSR, *see* Soviet Union
 U Thant, UN Secretary-General, 60
 Van Alstyne, Prof. William W., on voting rights law, 92
 Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, 106
 Vietnam war, 15, 16, 23, 62-70, 113, 130, 145, 146

- Votes, in 1964 election, 135
Voting age, 149
Voting registration in South, 88
Voting restrictions, 148
Voting Rights Law, 91
- Wages, 31, 36, 42, 118; of farm workers, 50-51; of teachers, 121
Wallace, Gov. George C., 90, 91
Walter-McCarran Immigration Act, 106
"War on poverty," 28-29, 132
War orders, 57
War Resisters League, 65, 68
Ward, Horace, 137
Warren, Justice Earl, 147
Warren Commission, on assassination of President Kennedy, 97
Wars, cost of, 17
Washington March Against War, 67
Washington March for Jobs and Freedom, 75, 115
Weissbourd, Bernard, 93
Welch, Robert, 141
Welfare legislation, AMA opposition to, 46
Welfare and relief, 41, 43
West Germany, 13, 63
White Citizens Councils, 84, 85
White-collar workers, 116
Wickenden, Elizabeth, on welfare services, 42
- Wiesner, Dr. Jerome B., 56
Williams, Robert F., 96
Willis, A. W., Jr., 137
Wilson, Dagmar, 59, 62, 100
Wirin, A. L., 104
Wirtz, W. Willard, 50, 51
Women, 132; in Congress, 136; income of, 33; Negro, 115; in unions, 115; workers, 32, 49, 52, 71, 126
Women Strike for Peace, 59, 61, 68, 100
Women's Int'l League for Peace and Freedom, 60, 68
Work injuries and deaths, 37
Workmen's compensation, 38, 51
Worthy, William, 104
- Yasui, Kaoru, 100
Yeagley, J. Walter, 102
Yellin, Edward, 99-100
York, Herbert F., 56
Young People's Socialist League, 68
Young, Sen. Stephen M., 66, 141
Youth, unemployment, 33; unemployment among Puerto Ricans, 53
Youth Against War & Fascism, 68-69
Yugoslavia, 47, 133
- Zander, Arnold S., 145
Zemel, Louis, 104
Zeppelin, Harold, 101
Zinn, Howard, 81

LABOR FACT BOOK 17 / Labor Research Association

Reflecting the main events and issues of the period, the current volume devotes extended space to civil rights and to war-peace questions. The major section on labor and social conditions emphasizes the maldistribution of wealth and income, but also the war on poverty and the efforts to organize millions forgotten by the "affluent" society. Facts, figures and programs cover economic trends, profits, monopoly, and military budgets; political affairs and election results; civil liberties and social welfare, along with developments in the trade union movement. A fountain of ready and vital information.

(This book is also available in cloth at \$3.75)

**Among New World Paperbacks
on History and Society**

MILITARISM AND INDUSTRY by Victor Perlo	(nw-19)	1.65
PROBLEMS OF CONTEMPORARY HISTORY by R. Palme Dutt	(nw-29)	1.25
ESSAYS IN HISTORY OF AMERICAN NEGRO by H. Aptheker	(nw-47)	1.65
AMERICAN NEGRO SLAVE REVOLTS by Herbert Aptheker	(nw-24)	2.25
RECONSTRUCTION: BATTLE FOR DEMOCRACY by James S. Allen	(nw-23)	1.65
A STAR TO STEER BY , Captain Hugh Mulzac	(nw-25)	1.85
NO MEN ARE STRANGERS by Joseph North	(nw-11)	1.65
JOHN BROWN by W. E. B. Du Bois	(nw-16)	2.25
THE ALDERSON STORY by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn	(nw-22)	1.65
THE CASE OF JOE HILL by Philip S. Foner	(nw-54)	1.45
LABOR FACT BOOK 17 by Labor Research Association	(nw-51)	1.65
THE LIFE AND TEACHING OF KARL MARX by John Lewis	(nw-53)	1.95

Write for a complete catalog of New World Paperbacks

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS

381 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y. 10016